

Message

From: Dominguez, Alexander [dominguez.alexander@epa.gov]
Sent: 7/12/2017 8:28:31 PM
To: McMurray, Forrest [mcmurray.forrest@epa.gov]
CC: Gunasekara, Mandy [Gunasekara.Mandy@epa.gov]; Dravis, Samantha [dravis.samantha@epa.gov]; Bolen, Brittany [bolen.brittany@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: Meeting with Boeing and GE
Attachments: Boeing and GE.docx

Attached are the materials

From: Gunasekara, Mandy
Sent: Wednesday, July 12, 2017 9:15 AM
To: McMurray, Forrest <mcmurray.forrest@epa.gov>; Dravis, Samantha <dravis.samantha@epa.gov>; Bolen, Brittany <bolen.brittany@epa.gov>
Cc: Dominguez, Alexander <dominguez.alexander@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Meeting with Boeing and GE

Yes – we will. I have Alex working on it now and will send material over when he is done.

From: McMurray, Forrest
Sent: Wednesday, July 12, 2017 9:05 AM
To: Gunasekara, Mandy <Gunasekara.Mandy@epa.gov>; Dravis, Samantha <dravis.samantha@epa.gov>; Bolen, Brittany <bolen.brittany@epa.gov>
Subject: Meeting with Boeing and GE

Good morning!

Hope you all are having a good week. Do you have any material you would like for me to include in the administrators briefing binder in regards to tomorrow's meeting with Boeing and GE?

Forrest McMurray
Special Assistant of Scheduling and Advance
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Office: 202-564-5088
Cell: Ex. 6

Message

From: Dravis, Samantha [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=ECE53F0610054E669D9DFFE0B3A842DF-DRAVIS, SAM]
Sent: 7/12/2017 9:30:34 PM
To: Lovell, Will (William) [lovell.william@epa.gov]
Subject: FW: Meeting with Boeing and GE
Attachments: Boeing and GE.docx

Pls print these

From: Dominguez, Alexander
Sent: Wednesday, July 12, 2017 4:29 PM
To: McMurray, Forrest <mcmurray.forrest@epa.gov>
Cc: Gunasekara, Mandy <Gunasekara.Mandy@epa.gov>; Dravis, Samantha <dravis.samantha@epa.gov>; Bolen, Brittany <bolen.brittany@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Meeting with Boeing and GE

Attached are the materials

From: Gunasekara, Mandy
Sent: Wednesday, July 12, 2017 9:15 AM
To: McMurray, Forrest <mcmurray.forrest@epa.gov>; Dravis, Samantha <dravis.samantha@epa.gov>; Bolen, Brittany <bolen.brittany@epa.gov>
Cc: Dominguez, Alexander <dominguez.alexander@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Meeting with Boeing and GE

Yes – we will. I have Alex working on it now and will send material over when he is done.

From: McMurray, Forrest
Sent: Wednesday, July 12, 2017 9:05 AM
To: Gunasekara, Mandy <Gunasekara.Mandy@epa.gov>; Dravis, Samantha <dravis.samantha@epa.gov>; Bolen, Brittany <bolen.brittany@epa.gov>
Subject: Meeting with Boeing and GE

Good morning!

Hope you all are having a good week. Do you have any material you would like for me to include in the administrators briefing binder in regards to tomorrow's meeting with Boeing and GE?

Forrest McMurray
Special Assistant of Scheduling and Advance
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Office: 202-564-5088
Cell:

Ex. 6

Message

From: Bolen, Brittany [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=31E872A691114372B5A6A88482A66E48-BOLEN, BRIT]
Sent: 5/16/2017 3:52:25 PM
To: Dravis, Samantha [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=ece53f0610054e669d9dffe0b3a842df-Dravis, Sam]; Brown, Byron [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=9242d85c7df343d287659f840d730e65-Brown, Byro]; Jackson, Ryan [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=38bc8e18791a47d88a279db2fec8bd60-Jackson, Ry]
Subject: FW: RRTF submissions
Attachments: Transcript of EPA Office of Air and Radiation Stakeholder Conference Call (held 4.24.2017).pdf; OAR Memo Executive Order 13777 FINAL_5_15_17.pdf; OW response May 15 EO 13777.docx; EPA-HQ-OW-5-2-2017UPDATED_for_docket_May_15.docx; OLEM Outreach and Meeting Summaries EO 13777_May_15_2017.docx; OLEM Stakeholder Comments EO 13777_May_15_2017.xlsx; RegulatoryReformOptions-OCSP_2070-05-15.pdf; OSDBU Regulatory Reform Recommendations 5.15.17.docx; OSDBU Executive Order 13777 Public Feedback Matrix1.xlsx; EO13777OCIR.DOCX

Reg Task Force: feedback from program offices per the Administrator's March 27 memorandum attached. Please note these are deliberative, pre-decisional for the Task Force and should not be distributed outside the Agency.

From: Nickerson, William
Sent: Tuesday, May 16, 2017 10:11 AM
To: Bolen, Brittany <bolen.brittany@epa.gov>
Subject: RRTF submissions

I haven't seen one yet from OEI or regional comments compiled by OCIR.

Attached are

OAR (RRTF submittal and transcript of the meeting)
OW (RRTF submittal and transcript of the meeting)
OLEM (RRTF submittal and summary of comments from their meeting)
OCSP (RRTF submittal)
OSDBU (RRTF submittal and summary of comments from their meeting)
OCIR (summary of the Big 10 and NGA meetings)

EPA

Moderator: Andrea Drinkard
April 24, 2017
11:00 a .m. ET

Operator: This is conference # 8535873.

Good morning. My name is (LaShonda), and I will be your conference operator today.

At this time, I would like to welcome everyone to the Executive Order 13777 on Enforcing the Regulatory Agenda.

All lines have been placed on mute to prevent any background noise. After the speakers' remarks, there will be a question-and-answer session. If you would like to ask a question during this time, simply press star then the number 1 on your telephone keypad. If you would like to withdraw your question, press the pound key.

Thank you. I would now turn today's call over to Andrea Drinkard to begin. Please go ahead.

Andrea Drinkard: Thank you, (LaShonda), and thank you everyone for joining us today. I am Andrea Drinkard, deputy communications director for the Office of Air and Radiation.

Let me start by providing an overview of the structure of today's call. First, we will hear a few minutes of opening remarks from Sarah Dunham, acting assistant administrator for the Office of Air and Radiation.

Following Sarah's remarks, I will provide a summary of the logistics for today's call, and then we'll turn it over to you, our stakeholders. Let's get started.

Sarah Dunham: Thank you, Andrea. Good morning, and thank you for joining us. My name is Sarah Dunham, and I'm the acting administrator for the Office of Air and Radiation at EPA.

On February 24, 2017, President Trump issued Executive Order 13777 on Enforcing the Regulatory Agenda. The Executive Order, among other things, requires each agency to create a Regulatory Reform Task Force to evaluate existing regulations and identify any that should be repealed, replaced or modified.

To inform these recommendations, EPA is holding today's public meeting so we can hear from those directly impacted by our regulations, including federal, state, local and tribal governments, small businesses, nongovernmental organizations and trade associations.

We invite you to take this opportunity to share your views here today. We also invite you to submit your comments to EPA's Regulatory Reform Docket, EPA-HQ-OA-2017-0190. The docket, which is accessible through www.regulations.gov, will remain open through May 15, 2017.

We will give equal consideration to input provided through the docket or through this teleconference. Your input as well as that received through other meetings and written comments will inform EPA's Regulatory Reform efforts and help fulfill the EPA's commitment to complying with Executive Order 13777.

Today's teleconference is not the only meeting EPA is holding on Regulatory Reform. The administrator has also directed the other EPA offices to provide recommendations and consult with their stakeholders and doing so. A list of EPA's planned meetings can be found on our regulatory reform website, www.epa.gov/laws-regulations/regulatory-reform.

Under the Executive Order, the Regulatory Reform Task Force is asked to provide a report to the administrator detailing the agency's progress by May 26th.

Once again, thank you for joining us today. I'm going to turn it back over to Andrea for some logistics for today's call.

Andrea Drinkard: Thank you, Sarah.

And as we said, today's call is an operator-assisted teleconference. As the operator has said, if you wish to speak at any time, you may nominate yourself to speak by hitting star-1 on your phone. Your name will be added to a queue. Speakers will be asked to deliver up to three minutes of remarks. You will hear a chime when you have 30 seconds remaining. When you hear that sound, please start wrapping up.

In order to hear from as many stakeholders as possible, we will be adhering strictly the three-minute time limit. If you continue to be on three minutes, we may interrupt you so that we may -- we can move on to the next speaker.

We will be hearing until 2 p.m., and we will do our best to hear from everyone who wishes to speak. As a reminder, this is EPA's opportunity to hear from you, our stakeholders. We will be in listening mode and will not be answering questions about specific rules or actions.

If you do not have an opportunity to speak on the call or you have additional remarks to go beyond the three-minute time limit, please submit your input to the EPA docket as Sarah said. EPA will be giving equal consideration to input provided through either of these methods.

And with that, we'll turn it over to the operator who will compile the list of questions.

(LaShonda)?

Operator: At this time, if you would like to ask an audio question, please press star-1 on your telephone keypad. We'll pause for just a moment to compile the Q&A roster.

OK. And our first question comes from the line of Cindy Folkers with Beyond Nuclear.

Cindy Folkers: Hi, can you hear me? Hello?

Andrea Drinkard: Yes, we can hear you.

Cindy Folkers: Hi. Yes, I actually had a comment so we can give those now?

Andrea Drinkard: Yes.

Cindy Folkers: OK. I'm Cindy Folkers from Beyond Nuclear. Thank you for the opportunity to comment today.

Executive Order 13777 is asking to, quote, "alleviate unnecessary regulatory burden placed on the American people," unquote. For Americans, radioactivity from the 19th and 20th century energy sources we've been using remains a health burden, and current regulations are not protective enough for women, children and pregnancy.

Adult males are more resistant to radiation than adult females who are less sensitive than male children who are, in turn, less sensitive than their female counterparts. That means that -- that means that for the same dose of radiation, women and children suffer more cancers than men. But more troubling the dataset on which this health information is based does not account for constant contamination of air and water that results from nuclear and coal technologies or exposures resulting from inhalation or ingestion. These data also represent just cancer and do not include non-cancer impacts.

Pregnancy, a uniquely vulnerable life stage, is not fully represented in this data and not fully protected by our current radiation standards. If EPA wants to streamline their regulation, they should modify them to protect the most

vulnerable life stages, which are pregnancy and childhood and get rid of more complicated less protective exposure standards. EPA should assume that pregnancy is a constant state in the population and set any radiation standards to protect it.

Do EPA radiation protection standards place an undue burden on the American people? For women, children and pregnancy, the answer is yes, because the exposure standards fail to protect them adequately.

Just as important, we are at the -- we are at the precipice of energy decisions, which will change our environment and civilization as we know it. EPA needs to encourage efforts that inform the public of this increased scientifically validated health burden on women and early life stages. That way the public and politicians can factor this information into decisions for our energy future and understand that continuing use of coal energy or using nuclear power to combat climate change means asking already overburdened women and children to continue to pay a higher health price.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment, and I will be submitting formal written comments by the May 15th deadline.

Andrea Drinkard: Excellent. Thank you very much for your input.

Operator, would you please open the next line?

Operator: Our next question comes from the line of Anne Gobin with Connecticut Department of Environment.

Anne Gobin: Good morning. Anne Gobin, I'm the director of Connecticut Air Program. Like EPA, our mission is to protect the health and wellbeing of all people and the environment. Although we've made great progress, our air is not clean and we continue working hard to reduce our carbon footprint by burning less fossil fuel.

EPA needs to continue on this positive path to achieve clean air standards and address climate change. No regulation should be struck without a replacement

that achieves as much, if not more protection of public health and the environment. Connecticut's population is exposed to an unacceptable risk from air pollution. More needs to be done.

EPA should be addressing additional rules -- should be adopting additional rules to address air pollution problems and fulfill its obligations under the Clean Air Act. The Good Neighbor Provision has not been fully implemented as required. Interstate transport has not been effectively regulated.

Both EPA and state and local air programs need to be adequately funded to fulfill the obligations we have. The proposed cuts, if implemented, would devastate our efforts. We're already inadequately funded to carry out our obligations to protect public health and the environment under the Clean Air Act.

Funding increases are needed. Cuts will prevent us from fulfilling our obligations.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Andrea Drinkard: Thank you, Anne.

Operator, would you open the next line please?

Operator: Certainly. Our next comment comes from the line of Scott Lewit with Structural Composites.

Scott Lewit: Hi, good morning. Thank you for taking my call. Scott Lewit, president of Structural Composites and Compsys, Inc. We're located down here in Melbourne, Florida; a small business with about 70 employees.

We've been impacted by the SNAP rule. This is concerning for us. Basically, what's happened is they take ozone regulations and now apply them to greenhouse gases.

We use urethane foam in our process that requires 134A as a blowing agent. And, you know, we've had to change blowing agents in the past under EPA rules like from R22 to the less harmful 134A. And in that transition and the prior ones, we had an alternative.

The difference this time is we do not have an alternative, and EPA has forced us to commit to a date with no alternative. With that, we had no alternative but to sue the EPA, and we currently have a lawsuit with the EPA.

As we've gone in with the National Marine Manufacturers Association, our industry trade group, numerous meetings with the EPA, basically we've run into a hard wall where the past administration has refused to look at any logic whatsoever. The EPA has an inability to distinguish between recurring and non-recurring pollution. This technology that we're generating funded by the Small Business Administration, SBI, our program for the Navy, has resulted in weight savings in transportation for semi-trailers up to 20 percent and installation qualities up to 40 percent higher.

We can show that we can offset the greenhouse gases in as little as two years to fuel savings. However, the EPA will not look at this.

So what we're asking is three things. We think the SNAP should not be applied to ozone -- you know, should not -- greenhouse gases should be segregated from ozone regulation, and SNAP should not be applied to regulation of 134A.

Subject to that notwithstanding, we would request a narrow use limitation to allow us to continue to make our product, which again we can demonstrate has profound impact on greenhouse gas, not to mention light weighting, reduced wear and tear on roads and longevity.

We also ask that the methods be evaluated so that the EPA and Department of Energy can work together and look at recurring and non-recurring pollution so that we can make smart decisions. If we make a windmill, it takes some time to make it. We're going to have some environmental impact. And with that,

we can offset that environmental impact with electricity generation. We got to make those tradeoffs. That's what's happening here in Transportation.

We're lighter, more efficient, longer lasting. We can show the benefit, but the EPA really put blinders on and will not look at these tradeoffs.

Thank you for taking my comment.

Andrea Drinkard: Thank you very much, Scott.

Operator, would you open the next line?

Operator: Our next comment comes from the line of Laura Bender with American Lung Association.

Laura Bender: Thank you. My name is Laura Kate Bender. I'm the director of Advocacy for the Healthcare Campaign with the American Lung Association. We're the nation's oldest voluntary health organization, and our mission is to save lives by improving lung health and preventing lung disease.

EPA is to be seeking input today on existing regulations that could be made less burdensome. I'm speaking today to represent the more than 125 million Americans who live in places with unhealthy air. These Americans are currently shouldering the burden of air pollution. They rely on EPA standards to monitor and adjust to air quality in their communities. On their behalf, the Lung Association asks EPA not to block, weaken or delay existing protections under the Clean Air Act.

To encourage citizen participation in this process, we also request that EPA expand opportunities for public comments.

The timing and format of today's hearing made it challenging for many stakeholders to join, so I'm going to share two of their stories.

(Laura Paul) and her son (Tyler) live in Clarendon, Texas, and rely on EPA's current Clear Air Standards. Here are some comments from (Laura).

I quote, “My son (Tyler) was healthy when he was born, but around one year of age he began getting sick all the time. He was later diagnosed with asthma and over the years, he has been hospitalized more times than I can count. Fortunately, now that (Tyler) is 14, his condition has stabilized, but we still have to be vigilant. When your child has asthma, you never stop worrying. Every time your child goes to school, into a friend’s house, you’re aware that poor air quality or some other unexpected situation could put him or her in danger, and you might not be there to help.

Scientists and doctors tell us it’s risky for children with asthma to inhale pollutants. (Tyler)’s lungs are already sensitive. When he breathes in a powerful irritant like ozone, his lung tissue swells further, making it harder for him to breathe. He coughs and (leads into) struggles. And we know how quickly a severe asthma attack can become a life-threatening emergency.

As a mother, I’m deeply saddened and if there’s even a possibility that EPA would weaken air pollution standards, rolling back limits in ozone and other danger pollution would put our children in harm’s way. On behalf of mothers everywhere, I urge EPA to do its job by maintaining strong air pollution limits and continuing to enforce life-saving measures to clean it up,” end quote.

Now I’d like to share a few comments from (Tyler Paul), (Laura)’s son. I quote, “If you never had asthma, you can’t imagine what it feels like to not be able to breathe. Picture being under water and something is preventing you from getting to the surface.

I’ve had asthma since I was a very little kid. Now that I’m 14, I’m happy that my asthma is under control, but I know that it can change at any time. I can’t pretend I don’t have it because my asthma will never go away.

I want to testify on behalf of all kids with asthma. Air pollution makes it harder for kids like me to breathe. I may only be 14, but I know that I have a right to clean air. That’s why I’m speaking up today. I hope that what I’ve had to say will make a difference,” end quote.

On behalf of the American Lung Association and the people in communities we serve, including families like (Tyler)'s, we strongly urge EPA to defend and enforce life-saving protections under the Clean Air Act. We will also submit detailed written comments for the record.

Finally, to request that EPA offer expanded opportunities to submit comments. Thank you.

Andrea Drinkard: Thank you, Laura.

Operator, next line?

Operator: Our next comment comes from the line of David Doniger with NRDC.

David Doniger: Thank you very much. On behalf of NRDC's three million members and supporters, I want to register a strong opposition to the Trump administration's destructive and unpopular agenda of rolling back public health and environmental safeguards.

We have a shared moral obligation to provide clean air and a safe and healthy climate for future generations, but I don't rest my case there. The Clean Air Act is the finest public investment with the best rate of return for the American people. It has prevented more than 160,000 deaths and 1.7 million asthma attacks each year.

Over its 50-year history, the Clean Air Act has saved literally millions of lives and averted tens of millions of serious illnesses. The Clean Air Act has prevented environmental catastrophes ranging from the loss of lakes and forests to acid rain, massive ozone-induced crop and forest damage and destruction of the ozone layer.

Taking the lead out of gasoline has protected millions of kids from brain damage, and it's copied all around the world.

In purely economic terms, it's air pollution that is a job killer. Without the Clean Air Act, American workers would lose 13 million more work days to illness every year. Tens of millions of work days lost for adults and tens of millions of school days lost for children have been avoided over the last five decades by the Clean Air Act.

The -- more than 2.5 million people in America already work in clean energy. That's triple the number in the coal, oil and gas industries. And the Clean Air Act delivers up to \$90 in public health benefits for every dollar invested in curbing pollution.

The job isn't done. We specifically object to the plans to roll back the Clear Power Plan, the Clean Car and Truck Standards, the Mercury and Air Toxic Standards, EPA's Methane Standards. Unfortunately, I could go on.

Americans did not vote to roll back clean air, clean energy and climate safeguards. The polls show that strong majorities -- including majorities of Trump voters -- want to keep or strengthen clean air and climate safeguards, energy efficiency measures, water pollution safeguards and my statement will summarize that polling.

I call on you to stop this sham. You're cramming public input on clean air into a three-hour teleconference run out of Washington.

By contrast, EPA held literally hundreds of stakeholder meetings and public hearings in multiple cities, over the course of three years to get all sides' input into just one regulation, the Clean Power Plan.

Abandon this roll back process and get back to doing your job.

The Back2Basics course that Administrator Pruitt has charted...

Andrea Drinkard: (Excuse me), David, your...

David Doniger: ...is a Back2Pollution detour.

Andrea Drinkard: David, your time is up.

David Doniger: Thank you.

Andrea Drinkard: Thank you very much.

Operator, would you open the next line?

Operator: Our next comment comes from the line of Timothy Hunt with the American Wood Council.

Timothy Hunt: Yes, my name is Tim Hunt. I'm the senior director of Air Quality Programs at the American Wood Council. AWC is the voice of North Americans wood products manufacturing, representing over 75 percent of an industry that provides approximately 400,000 men and women in the United States with family wage jobs. AWC makes products that are essential to everyday life from a renewable resource that absorbs and sequesters carbon.

We believe EPA should address the rapidly developing air permitting gridlock under the Clean Air Act by adopting more flexible policies and use of more realistic commissions data and modeling tools that will protect the environment and public health.

Every five years we must -- EPA must decide whether the National Ambient Air Quality Standards are sufficiently protective of public health. Recently, EPA has systematically tightened the NAAQS for several standards. Traditionally, the focus of the program has been on states developing plans to improve air quality in non-attainment areas, usually cities to meet the NAAQS.

However, since the NAAQS are effective immediately in rural areas where we operate, mills contemplating expansions or modifications that trigger a permitting review must demonstrate that emissions from the mill when combined with background air quality do not exceed the applicable NAAQS standard in order to obtain a permit. This results in a permit stalemate.

When the NAAQS levels, having dropped closer to background levels, is becoming more difficult to, quote, “pass the test and get an approved permit.” To prevent further ratcheting, EPA should not lower standards further until current standards are fully implemented and met. During this time, air quality will continue to improve under current programs.

The inability to permit a project hurts the competitiveness of the mill, harms product development, prevents meeting customer needs and hampers innovation, and it thwarts environmentally beneficial projects which can lower emissions. Local communities will miss out on new job and economic growth while industry faces the risk of becoming uncompetitive in the global marketplace of wood products. The decline of permit submittals to states is a strong indication of this growing problem. Adapting new permitting policies by EPA could help alleviate the problem.

The challenges with the (ever-tightening) NAAQS are exacerbated by a lack of or inappropriate emission measurement methods, poor estimates of emissions, use of unrealistic air dispersion models and several rigid permitting policies.

AWC has provided EPA several suggestions in the recent past and will do so again including lower and fugitive P.M. emission estimates, acknowledging limited emissions from intermittent sources and using more realistic receptor locations. EPA’s own recognitions of the advantages of probabilistic tools in its ORD report from 2014 should be incorporated into the permitting guidance to replace older deterministic approaches and avoid overestimates.

Finally, EPA should reestablish its partnership with states and give them more latitude to advance new approaches...

Andrea Drinkard: Thank you, Tim. Your...

Timothy Hunt: ...and models.

Andrea Drinkard: ...time is up.

Timothy Hunt: Thank you.

(Off-mic)

Andrea Drinkard: If you have more comments, you can submit them to the Docket. Thank you.

Operator, would you open the next line?

Operator: Certainly. As a reminder, to make a comment, please press star-1 on your telephone keypad.

Our next comment comes from the line of Albert Donnay with Donnay (Toxicology).

Albert Donnay: Thank you. My name is Albert Donnay. I'm a consulting toxicologist testifying today on my own behalf.

A regulation that I'm asking EPA to repeal or modify the Clean Air Act's National Ambient Air Quality Standards for carbon monoxide. The next lower reliable C.O. exposure from 100 parts per million to just 9 parts per million average over eight hours and 35 ppm over one hour. EPA has cited these standards since 1975 as the basis for requiring catalytic converters on vehicles to convert C.O. to CO₂.

This regulation has caused American car buyers over \$80 billion in the last 40 years, but the C.O. NAAQS has never been based on any studies showing that outdoor C.O. levels ever posed any health hazards to anyone nor on any studies showing that C.O. exposures below the NAAQS limits are safe.

In our latest review published in 2011, EPA said only six human exposure studies published in the 80's and 90's, five of them commissioned or conducted by EPA where sufficient quality to be cited as the basis of the C.O. NAAQS, but none tested any eight-hour C.O. exposures and their one-hour exposures were all above the EPA's one hour 35 ppm limit.

In the largest study (inaudible) with heart disease, C.O. exposures varied from 42 to 357 parts per million, while smaller studies exposed 96, five men and five women total to C.O. from 50 to 200 ppm. But since they are reported finding adverse effects in people with heart disease at these levels, none provided any assurance that EPA's lower limits are low enough to prevent such outcomes.

Over 200 air pollution epidemiology studies that included C.O. in their analysis suggest otherwise. They almost all report finding significant health effects associated with small increases in C.O. far below the NAAQS limits and within the range of 1 to 2 ppm that now prevail in most cities. But Administrator Jackson excluded these and all other types of C.O. studies from being cited as the basis for the NAAQS in the last review.

More than 15,000 studies in all even at the six studies she cited had tested relevant C.O. levels at or below the NAAQS limits instead of above them. Other aspects of the design undermining the result and (test out) on their fitness for policymaking. None preserved their data. Five used their quality control lab that could not reliably produce its results for a critical carboxyhemoglobin measurements, and all six of them mistook the subjects being as carboxyhemoglobin as an independent measure of C.O. uptake when it's actually a measure of C.O. excretion and dependent on their actual arterial COHb, which they didn't measure.

For all these reasons, I ask EPA to revoke or at least suspend the C.O. NAAQS until a new C.O. Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee can be appointed to consider all the peer-reviewed articles published on C.O....

(Crosstalk)

Albert Donnay: ...for last review. Thank you. And (inaudible) some new limits if needed based on studies whose data are available for independent review. Thank you.

Andrea Drinkard: Should we -- operator, (move) over the next line?

Thank you, Albert.

Operator: Our next comment comes from the line of Scott Evans with Clean Air Engineering.

Scott Evans: Hi, this is Scott Evans from Clean Air. I'd like comment on the EPA's use of guidance documents to implement rulemaking.

On EPA's Emission Measurement Center website, there are a series of EMC guideline documents that have been collected by EPA since 1988. They're currently numbered now one through 53 with a few gaps in them, and these are guidance on a variety of monitoring and emission measurement issues.

My problem is that many of these currently are technically obsolete. There appears to be no mechanism for ongoing review for relevance or obsolescence. For example, one particular guidance document that is causing me particular problem is GD33, which has to do with Test Methods 25 and 25A. I believe that it is an obsolete document.

The unfortunate part is that these guidance documents turn into the rule of law even though they are called "guidance documents" because they appear, they are relied on by states, for example, and state permits. They are relied on when doing other rulemakings in terms of SPS or MACT rules. And so these guidance document are taken at face value and not periodically reviewed apparently.

But more importantly, they seem to be contrary to the Administrative Procedures Act. I'll read one sentence on the website that contains these documents. The last sentence in the introductory paragraph says, "Some of the guidance may result in changes to the methods or performance specification." This is the part that I believe is contrary to the Administrative Procedures Act, which requires notice and comment rulemaking for all changes to methods and performance specification.

I would propose that EPA rescind all of these guideline documents unless EPA can come up with a compelling reason why they cannot submit them to

the notice and comment rulemaking procedure. And thank you very much for the opportunity to provide these comments.

Andrea Drinkard: Thank you very much, Scott.

Operator, next line please?

Operator: Our next comment comes from the line of Andrea Field with UARG.

Andrea Field: My name is Andrea Field. I'm making this statement on behalf of the Utility Air Regulatory Group, UARG.

UARG is a not-for-profit association of individual electric generating companies and national trade associations. Since 1977, UARG has participated in many Clean Air Act administrative proceedings focused on electric generating companies and in the litigation arising from those proceedings.

Because electric generating companies have so often been targets of EPA rules, UARG members have substantial experience with the unnecessary burden and excessive cost associated with regulatory compliance. UARG therefore endorses the idea of EPA's modifying, replacing and repealing agencies' programs that are outdated or unnecessarily costly, complex or burdensome or impose costs that exceed program benefits.

UARG believes such changes can be made consistent with the requirements and goals of the Clean Air Act. UARG will be filing comprehensive comments by May 15th. Today though, we offered just a few comments on some of the regulatory programs that we believe EPA can and should address as it's about complying with Executive Order 13777.

First, UARG believes the Clean Power Plan and Carbon Dioxide New Source Performance Standards for new and modified and constructed -- reconstructed electric generating units are unlawful. UARG, therefore, supports EPA's already commenced review of these rules.

UARG believes that EPA's greenhouse gas reporting -- mandatory reporting program exceeds EPA's information gathering authority under the Clean Air Act. Facilities are now expending enormous resources, tracking, quality assuring and reporting vast amounts of information. EPA also continues to spend significant resources for both its own staff and agency contractors to implement the rule.

Since 2009, EPA has promulgated dozens of revisions to the GHG mandatory reporting program, although you are going to understand that many of these rule revisions have been directed at correcting errors or simplifying data collection and reporting the need with so many revisions underscores the already complicated nature of the program.

For the reasons pointed out in UARG's pending petition for partial reconsideration, EPA should reconsider and modify key aspects of the cross-state air pollution rule update for the 2008 Ozone Ambient Standards. That rule's serious flaws result in a new regulatory program that imposes cost in excess of any reasonable measure or projected benefits and it threatens jobs in the energy sector.

We also have suggestions for changing EPA's visibility program and the unnecessary cost and burdens of pre-construction permitting. We also recognize that members who spent billions of dollars complying with other Clean Air Act programs, and although most of this cost of compliance come from the purchase and installation and operation of controls, they also come from periodic performance testing, continuous emission monitoring, record keeping and reporting that are also costly.

We believe this can be avoided.

Andrea Drinkard: Thanks very much, Andrea. Your time is up.

Andrea Field: Thank you.

Andrea Drinkard: Operator, open the next line. Thank you.

Operator: Our next comment comes from the line of Charlie Jiang with the (Environment for) Defense Fund.

Charlie Jiang: Hi. My name is Charlie Jiang with Environmental Defense Fund. I am speaking on behalf of myself today.

As a young person, I will be (harmed) by the regulations EPA is attempting to roll back. EPA -- critical regulations that protect millions of Americans including (inaudible) health from the dangerous effects of air pollution.

I was lucky enough to grow up in a neighborhood that benefit from 45 years of EPA's common sense clean air protection. I was able to go to school every day to spend time outside with my friends and to receive an education and upbringing that enables me to be a productive American. But many of my peers across the country are having a different experience. They suffer from asthma, missed school because the air is too dirty for them to leave their house or have lost family members due to toxic air pollution.

It is crucial that we preserve and strengthen EPA's climate and clean air safeguards to ensure all Americans, regardless of race, geography, age or income can enjoy the benefits of a healthy, breathable atmosphere.

Any attempt to undo these so-called "burdensome regulations" are dangerous and that will only start to benefit wealthy executives while putting my life and those of millions of my fellow Americans in harm's way. I urge EPA to uphold and strengthen its critical clean air environment protection and listen to the large majority of Americans who support strong regulations that clean up the air we all breathe.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment today.

Andrea Drinkard: Thank you, Charlie.

Operator, would you open the next line please?

Operator: Our next comment comes from the line of Mandy Warner with Environmental Defense Fund.

Mandy Warner: Thank you. My name is Mandy Warner, and I am with Environmental Defense Fund. Today, however, I am speaking on behalf of myself and my family.

I have two daughters, ages four years and 11 months. I'm gravely concerned with actions EPA may take that would result in more pollution that can harm my children and millions of other children across the country.

I asked my four-year-old the other night why she thought clean air was important, and she said very simply, "So you can breathe." She's right, and that's what this stakeholder meeting should be all about -- ensuring clean air so kids can breathe.

We know from four and a half decades of environmental protection that the narrative of burdensome regulations is simply false. It's a narrative repeatedly disproven by industry's own actions to comply on time and more cheaply with standards reducing pollution for millions of Americans in the process.

There is an endless pool of worry parents have to contend with already. We worry about how much fish is safe for our children to eat every week to (inaudible) pollution, what days we need to be careful about letting our children play outside due to smoggy air, and what serious challenges our children will face from runaway climate change. And we rely upon EPA to set common sense safeguards to protect us from things we cannot protect our children from alone.

Please don't add to our worries by rolling back critical life-saving protections that can help ensure a healthier future for my children and children across America. Thank you.

Andrea Drinkard: Thank you, Mandy.

Operator, next line please?

Operator: And as a reminder, if you would like to make a comment, please press star-1 on your telephone keypad.

Our next comment comes from the line of Howard Feldman with American Petroleum Institute.

Howard Feldman: Good morning. Thank you, Sarah and Andrea.

API is the only national trade association representing all facets of the oil and natural gas industry, which supports 9.8 million U.S. jobs and 8 percent of the U.S. economy.

Record U.S. production refining is happening alongside greater environmental progress. CO2 emissions from power generation (advancing) near 30-year lows, thanks in large part to greater use of natural gas. Also cleaner burning transportation fuels and industry investments have reduced emissions of criteria pollutants. The oil and gas industry has succeeded despite the unprecedented level of federal regulatory actions targeting our industry.

Consistent with President Trump's stated objectives of American energy independence and economic growth, EPA and other federal agencies should embrace smart, cost-effective regulations while continuing to promote public health, safety and the environment.

API is preparing detailed written comments that I'd like to highlight three key air regulations. First, the 2016 oil and natural gas NSPS final rule, API submitted a detailed petition for administrative reconsideration of the final rule to Administrator McCarthy on August 2016. The previous 2012 standards developed in collaboration with industry along with industries incented to capture more of what we sell are already effectively reducing emissions.

We are encouraged by EPA's recent announcement to review the 2016 standards, and API supports a revision of those standards. Additionally, we urge EPA to act quickly to extend rapidly approaching compliance deadlines.

Secondly, there are a number of problems with the outdated RFS program. API recommends EPA should utilize its waiver authority to reduce the renewable fuel obligations to ensure the mandate does not exceed the E10 Blend Wall. In order to maintain a market for ethanol-free gasoline, EPA should not send an RFS mandate that would cause the average ethanol content to exceed 9.7 percent. EPA should reject cause to move the RFS point of obligation, and EPA should work with Congress to reform and ultimately end this unworkable program.

Moving to the Ozone NAAQS, API has commented previously that the more restrictive ozone standards imposed by EPA in late 2015 were unnecessary because ambient ozone levels were already declining under the 2008 standards, and the public health is already protected with an adequate margin of safety. Ozone levels will keep falling as the country works to fully implement the older standards and other federal regulations. Unfortunately, EPA's new standards create tremendous burden on states and risk significant impacts on job growth.

API supports EPA's reconsideration of the 2015 Ozone NAAQS based on the issues that API identified in its comments and corp briefs and is encouraged by EPA's motion to continue oral arguments on the 2015 Ozone NAAQS. It is difficult for states to harmonize activities towards the implementation of both -- the 2008 and 2015 NAAQS. Therefore, we'd encourage EPA to expeditiously complete its review.

In conclusion, we look forward to working with Administrator Pruitt, EPA leadership and staff on these and other rules. Regulatory action should be rooted in sound science and data with the consideration of the cost and benefits while protecting public health and the environment.

Andrea Drinkard: Thank you, Howard.

Operator, would you open the next line please?

Operator: Our next comment comes from the line of (Jerry Steffi) with Harley Davidson Motors.

(Jerry Steffi): Thank you very much. We appreciate the opportunity from EPA to comment on Executive Order 13777.

Our company has worked since the late 1970's closely with EPA on the development of motorcycle regulatory content, and we appreciate those relationships and dialogues.

Our comments today are more related to the processes and requirements related to on highway motorcycle certification, and that's foremost found in 40 CFR Part 86 sub Parts E and F around highway motorcycles.

We do believe that there are items that can be improved, modified or changed to reduce the burden on motor cycle manufacturers. In the first category, one item that Harley Davidson truly believes needs to be modified is that EPA gives consideration for the consolidation of the requirements and regulations that are presently found in multiple sources and therefore, causes undue burden on manufacturers.

Content with respect to motorcycle certification and requirements is found not only 40 CFR Part 86 but in many outdated advisories and guidances that are found at epa.gov and also in separate references found at EPA's website. This information by not being consolidated leads to excessive burden and extra time. In effect, we have heard from new manufacturers about how difficult it is to find information at particular times.

We also believe that there is a redundancy in EPA's informational requirements related to motorcycle certifications. When we consider the submittal processes on annual basis through EPA's CDX verify system, we find that we are giving the same information not only within EPA's database but in a separate section known as the upload compliance document section. An example of this specifically is the Tailpipe Emissions Data, which we requested to place in two different areas of the system. This redundancy is overly burdensome and leads to additional time that is not needed.

Also, we think EPA should consider removing the requirements for separate sets of Freedom of Information Act motorcycle submittals and files. We believe that they should be treated on a case by case basis and should not be created as a separate set of certification information on an annual basis. This leads to an undue burden in terms of the amount of time that's spent preparing regulatory documentation. This could be consolidated.

(Off-mic)

Andrea Drinkard: Your three minutes are up now. If you have...

(Jerry Steffi): OK.

Andrea Drinkard: ...additional comments, remember you can submit them to the docket.

Operator, would you open the next line?

Operator: And your next question or next comment comes from Jeff Cooper with RFA.

Jeff Cooper: Well, good morning. My name is Jeff Cooper, and I am representing the Renewable Fuels Association, which is the (USF) and oil industry's trade association.

I first wanted to thank EPA for hosting this call. We agree that there are a number of EPA regulations that today offer little or no consumer protection or environmental benefit and are unnecessarily burdensome and costly for both producers and consumers of renewable fuels like ethanol. Specifically, we believe several of the fuel regulations under the purview of EPA's Office of Transportation and Air Quality are right for major reform and streamlining. We will be submitting detailed comments to the docket on specific regulatory provisions that warrant significant modification.

Today, however, I wanted to focus on perhaps the most egregious example of a burdensome and unnecessary fuel regulation that offers no environmental benefit and is actually increasing the cost of fuel for U.S. consumers.

I'm referring to EPA fuel rules that effectively prohibit the sale of gasoline containing 15 percent ethanol known as E15 in the summertime in most of the country. In essence, EPA has refused to apply the same volatility or RVP standard to E15 that it applies to today's marketplace gasoline, which is E10. And this is even though E15 is slightly less volatile than E10 and therefore results in fewer volatile emissions. EPA requires E15 to meet a volatility standard in the summertime that is 11 percent more restrictive than the standard apply to today's gasoline.

Due to this prohibition on selling E15, during the summer months, most retail gas stations have chosen not to offer the fuel even though it is cheaper and a cleaner alternative with a higher octane rating. We believe this EPA-imposed market dysfunction can be corrected with simple administrative action. We believe EPA should level the playing field for E15 and today's E10 gasoline with respect to fuel volatility.

EPA could accomplish this by immediately extending the current E10 volatility standard to all ethanol blends including E15 or it could immediately lower the volatility limits for gasoline blend stock such that all finished ethanol blends would meet current gasoline volatility standards. While the E15 RVP barrier is our industry's most important regulatory barrier in the near-term, it is symptomatic of larger problems with our current fuel regulatory framework, and we look forward to submitting more detailed comments on some of those other provisions.

Lastly, I want to voice our strong support for the renewable fuel standard. I want to respond to the comment from API that we have an issue with the so-called "blend wall." In fact, ethanol content of gasoline last year already surpassed 10 percent well above the 9.7 percent safeguard that API is promoting. So I just wanted to make sure that it gets in the record that the blend wall is a fiction and should not be a consideration for EPA's rulemaking process on the RFS.

Thank you.

Andrea Drinkard: Yes. Thank you very much, Jeff.

Operator, next line please?

Operator: And your next comment comes from (Andrew Wilson).

(Andrew Wilson): Hi. My name is (Andrew Wilson). I am speaking on behalf of myself and about the EPA regulatory process.

In July of 2015, I went to Atlanta, Georgia, and testified on behalf of -- in favor of the Clean Power Plan. I was incredibly in favor of it then and saw the robust public process firsthand that happened over two conference rooms full all day long, people all day speaking on behalf of the EPA taking action on climate change responsibly. And out of that process came a very robust and very responsible regulation, and now we're being asked to roll it back.

In January of 2015, here in Austin where I live, I attended an EPA public hearing on the ozone -- or on the regional haze standard and there testified on behalf of myself and my children who go out and enjoyed Big Bend National Park that the regional haze problem is something that EPA needs to step in on and have more robust regulation of. And now we're being asked to roll that back. No, absolutely not.

And just two weeks later, in Arlington, I testified again on the Ozone Standard. And again all day long, people were testifying saying, "This is important. This is my air that we breathe. These are my children. Our air quality is negatively impacted, and EPA needs to act on that."

And I will repeat what I testified there then that I lost a friend. His name was (Jess). And (Jess) died of a massive asthma attack. And he lived in Salt Lake City, Utah. And on the day when he died, the ozone level in the air was at about 70 parts per million. We need to go further because every time we talk about rolling back the regulation, these are people's lives. These are my children's lives. This is our future on the planet, and we cannot move backwards on that, and we need to have a strong, robust process at least as robust as what we had in the past.

Thank you for your time.

Andrea Drinkard: Thank you, Andrew.

Operator, next comment.

Operator: Your next comment comes from the line of Ben Klein with Uranium Producers.

Ben Klein: Hi, thank you. I appreciate the opportunity to speak. On behalf of the Uranium Producers of America, I wanted to speak today for a few minutes about a rule that was initially proposed in January 2015, the Health and Environmental Protection Standards for Uranium and Thorium Mill Tailings.

Basically, the rule would require in situ uranium mine operators to conduct long-term monitoring among a number of other new requirements. And at the time the rule was initially proposed, EPA provided no justification for the rule, we felt they felt account for the cost. They didn't consider the small business impact. They also didn't follow a number of recommendations from their Science Advisory Board.

The EPA is acknowledged on a number of occasions. They're not aware of a single example of an ISR uranium project contaminating groundwater at an adjacent non-exempt aquifer. And the EPA has also acknowledged that they really didn't consult with the industry or state regulators, including Texas Commission on Environmental Quality who's been regulating the industry for more than three decades.

TCQ offered to work with the EPA. They offered to provide additional groundwater data. They offered to even conduct additional sampling if EPA had concerns about groundwater quality around current or historic uranium projects.

EPA has proposed a rule well beyond the agency's authority. This is a concern that was raised by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission who's really the primary regulator in this space.

We were pleased that EPA decided to withdraw the proposed rule on December 2016. However, the agency issued a new version of the proposed rule that is nearly identical on January 19th, so the last day of the last administration.

The new rule equally troubling, again there's no evidence to justify it in the docket. Nothing -- EPA doesn't consider any of the peer reviewed science that's out there. And essentially if the rule is finalized, it would make ISR uranium mining completely unattractive from a cost standpoint, and we'd see most of the ISR uranium projects.

And in the U.S., in a time when we're importing 94 percent of the uranium needed for our nuclear reactors, which provides 20 percent of our electricity, it seems the administration should be working with the industry to strengthen our domestic uranium mining rather than -- rather than pursuing the regulation that would eventually put the industry out of business. And so we know this is just a proposed rule, but it's up and it's generating considerable uncertainty. It's making it harder for companies to go out and raise capital. And so we're asking EPA to immediately withdraw the proposed rule and work with the industry as we go forward.

Thank you for your time.

Andrea Drinkard: Thank you, Ben.

Sorry, operator, could you open the next line?

Operator: And your next comment comes from the line of Joseph Stanko with the NAAQS Implementation Coalition.

Joseph Stanko: Thank you. I am counsel to the NAAQS Implementation Coalition, which includes trade associations, companies and other entities who confront

challenges in permitting and operating facilities under increasingly stringent National Ambient Air Quality Standards.

Our diverse membership reflects the impact that NAAQS implementation challenges have across the American economy. That is why addressing these challenges to create a reasonable path towards project development is critical to fostering economic expansion that creates well paying jobs and generates needed tax revenue to local communities throughout the country.

The Clean Air Act requires that those seeking to build or expand major facilities in attainment areas first provide prevention of significant deterioration PSD permits from EPA that demonstrate the permit project will not excessively degrade air quality. PSD permit applications make such demonstrations to remodeling using EPA approved tools and policies. However, the multiple layers of conservatism that EPA has historically built into these tools and policies have long been known to significantly overpredict the impacts.

Prior to recent changes to the NAAQS for NO₂, SO₂, PM_{2.5} and Ozone, there were sufficient headroom between NAAQS and facility emissions plus the ambient background that impacts from other sources such as this conservatism was not generally problematic.

With those margins, shrinking or disappearing is more stringent NAAQS approach background levels, our members are finding that overprediction resulting from these conservative tools and policies can be a significant even determining factor in project permitting demonstrations.

We believe EPA can implement a number of measures to improve NAAQS implementation tools and policies. This include updating preferred model performance of low wind speeds, eliminating overly burdensome photochemical grid modeling requirements for single sources and updating emission factors. Such improvements fit squarely within the regulatory review called for by E.O. 13777.

For example, under the category of eliminating jobs or inhibit job creation, overpredictions from NAAQS implementation tools and policies result in modeled air quality impacts that do not exist. These modeling glitches can effectively prevent a needed permit for closing projects.

In the category of outdated, unnecessary or ineffective, NAAQS implementation tools and policies, some of which have been overtaken by the agency's increasingly more stringent standards, EPA should update its outdated tools and policies to confront new NAAQS implementation challenges. Impose cost that exceed benefits, NAAQS implementation challenges are even inhibiting projects that would reduce emissions and then the category of inconsistent with regulatory reform initiatives, NAAQS implementation challenges have been identified in the Department of Commerce's manufacturing burden and request implementation.

We will be submitting comments for the record and appreciate the opportunity to address EPA. Thank you.

Andrea Drinkard: Thank you, Joe.

Operator, next comment please?

Operator: And your next comment comes from Rhett Cash with American Coatings.

Rhett Cash: My name is Rhett Cash, and I work for the American Coatings Association. ACA is a voluntary nonprofit trade association working as an advocate, an ally to advance the needs of the paint and coatings industry and the professionals who work in it.

ACA has flagged the following EPA regulations that could be repealed, replaced or modified to make them less burdensome without impacting the level of protection to the environment or the health and safety of our citizens.

First, ACA requests that EPA update its aerosol coatings regulations found in 40 CFR Part 59 sub Part E. Specifically, ACA requests that EPA update its reactivity values, adjusted default value, modify its regulatory language to

allow for changing the value of existing compounds and add new compounds to its tables. Our member companies are especially burdened by EPA's current aerosol coatings regulations because they are no longer consistent with the regulation found throughout the country especially California, which is the leader in aerosol and coatings regulations and who updated its rules in 2010.

EPA's current regulations mirror California's old regulation and need to be updated. Our proposed updates would promote uniformity in aerosol and coatings regulations throughout the country and reflect the most recent scientific research available.

Second, ACA requests that EPA eliminate its tri-annual reporting requirements for aerosol coatings. These requirements are not only burdensome and costly for industry, but also provide little, if any, useful value or information to EPA. If there are compliance issues, this information can be requested by the agency, and manufacturers would then be required to provide it. Clearly, the burden outweighs the benefit.

Third, ACA urges EPA to revert to the 2008 National Ozone Standard of 0.75 parts per million. In 2015, EPA lowered the National Ozone Standard from 0.75 ppm to 0.70 ppm. The lowering of the standard now require states to identify whether they are in attainment or non-attainment. If they are non-attainment, then those states must revise their state implementation plans and develop even stricter VOC emissions regulations. This change will be very costly on the coatings industry because it will limit business expansion and impair the ability of U.S. companies to create new jobs.

The high cost of this change outweigh the commensurate benefits to public health in the environment. Thus, ACA urges EPA to revert to the 2008 Ozone Standard and fully implement the standard so that the forward progress already achieved under it can be extended without unnecessarily burdening of the coatings industry.

Lastly , ACA requests that EPA amend the Clean Air Act regulations so that they extend the time for review of the Ozone Standard to every 10 years

instead of every five years to allow for more stability in the marketplace for formulators also protecting human health and the environment.

Thank you for the opportunity to discuss these regulations with u. We look forward to discussing and working with you and your regulatory reform efforts in the future. Thanks.

Andrea Drinkard: Thank you very much, Rhett.

Operator, would you open the next line please?

Operator: Certainly. As a reminder, to ask -- to make a comment, please press star-1 on your telephone keypad.

Our next comment comes from the line of Ben Henneke with Clean Air Action Corporation.

Ben Henneke: Good morning. This is Ben Henneke. I am president of Clean Air Action Corporation, a company that has been involved with reducing regulatory cost for over 25 years. I was appointed by President George H.W. Bush as a charter member of the Clean Air Act Advisory Committee and was appointed by each president then after. I served on that Advisory Committee until 2009. For over a decade, I was the co-chair of the Economic Incentives and Regulatory Innovation Subcommittee.

There are many existing EPA air and radiation regulations that put the burden of unnecessary cost and delays on the American people. Those delays and unnecessary cost harm America. Pollution also harms America through unnecessary sicknesses, medical cost, loss of productivity, decreased soil and water quality, and reduced land productivity.

The challenge for EPA is to reduce burdens from regulations and also reduce cost and burdens from the pollutants. If EPA air and radiation is able to accomplish this challenge, it will set a good example for other federal agencies and other EPA programs. To reduce both cost and pollution is not

actually difficult. I will outline three simple levels of increasing complexity and administrations effort that will accomplish this dual challenge.

At the simplest level, the EPA can provide state, tribal and local enforcement flexibility on a case by case basis. The requirements for a source or a manufacturer of pollution creating products to request the enforcement flexibility would be showing that using the alternative compliance approach would increase pollution reductions, accomplish them sooner than regulatory compliance would and, of course, reduce cost.

The source using that alternative would also provide public report to their emissions and the results of their alternative compliance.

The next level of complexity would be for the EPA to publish guidance to the states, tribal and local permitting and compliance agencies of formal trading mechanisms that would allow any source to use reductions beyond regulatory requirements that are made in the geographically (inaudible) areas. That type of mechanism will encourage early reduction solution, provide sources with a broad range of emission reductions that they can use to meet requirements.

The guidance would deal directly with local effects as well as assuring transparency on the creation (of) emissions reductions. Development of guidance should allow local flexibility to create improve approaches that are then included in regular new guidance. The guidance should require that the implementing agency would show the pollution reduction, existing regulations that the reductions would occur more rapidly and that both cost and delays would be reduced.

The greatest level of complexity but also the greatest benefits the environment and jobs throughout the nation, EPA would review existing regulations and any future regulations to determine what alternative methods pollution reductions for compliance exist or can be reasonably expected to become available within the next three years. This approach would allow sources, both stationary and mobile, to focus on the pollution reductions needed and be able to plan...

Andrea Drinkard: Thank you, Ben, for your comments. Your time is up. If you have additional comments, you can, of course, submit them to the docket.

Ben Henneke: Thank you.

Andrea Drinkard: Operator, would you open the next -- would you open the next line please?

Operator: Our next comment comes from the line of (Norbert Rigby).

(Norbert Rigby): Good morning. I am a non-governmental organization of one. I am going to address a radiation regulatory reform, and I would like the EPA to consider carefully a 2015 petition before the NRC Docket ID NRC2015-0057.

My comments on this are as follows. Discard and disavow the no-threshold hypothesis because it is not based on evidence, but has been a fraud from the start as Edward Calabrese documented at least in 2011, '13 and '15.

Discard and disavow the ALARA principle. It makes no sense in light of the huge temporal and spatial variability of background to those on planet Earth without any evidence of harm or risk resulting from the high end of that range.

Discard and disavow the concept of collective dose. It never made sense and no evidence exists to support its application.

Declare below regulatory concern, any chronic exposures below at least 250 millisievert or 25 REM per year. This is approximately the largely agreed upon chronic dose to some inhabitants of Ramsar in Iran, which is the highest currently known background location on planet Earth. Without any evidence of harm or risk caused by that dose, this limit may need to be erased as additional reliable information is obtained. They often suggest that limit of 100 millisievert or 10 REM is an arbitrary number plucked more or less from thin air. In summation, EPA must base regulations on observable evidence not on unsupported assumptions, projections and models.

Thank you for taking my comment.

Andrea Drinkard: Thank you very much, (Norbert).

Operator, next comment please?

Operator: Our next comment comes from the line of Tim Hogan with American Fuel.

Tim Hogan: I'm Tim Hogan, director, Motor Fuels at the American Fuel and Petrochemical Manufacturers. AFPM is a national trade association representing nearly 400 companies that encompass virtually all U.S. refining and petrochemical manufacturing capacity.

I will briefly cover three regulations we believe are the most burdensome for our member companies. The first is RFS. AFPM opposes government-mandated biofuel blending which distorts the free markets' efficient allocation of transportation fuels and disadvantages consumers.

The statute contains an aggressive schedule for renewable fuel blending. Declining gasoline demand and higher ethanol mandates threaten our nation's fuel supply. EPA must use realistic projections and continue to exercise this waiver authority to reduce some noble fuel obligations in recognition of the E10 blend wall. Just moving beyond the blend wall is not feasible for the existing fleet of motor vehicles, small engines and the field distribution infrastructure.

To ensure a playing field between refiners and large-exempt blenders, EPA must move the point of obligation to the position holder at the rack. The new Ozone Standard of 70 ppb increases the (inaudible) non-attainment areas due to background ozone levels, making it increasingly difficult to permit new facilities or modify existing facilities in these areas. In this regard, the current five-year review cycle for NAAQS does not provide enough opportunity for full implementation of preexisting NAAQS.

The administration can ease the burden by seeking to realign non-attainment designations for the 2015 Ozone NAAQS to 2025 to allow for full implementation of the 2008 Ozone NAAQS and other federal and state rules that will continue to reduce ozone information. Neither the 2008 review nor

the more recent ozone studies justify lowering the standard based on the health effects of exposure, therefore, EPA -- therefore, the administration should take steps to increase the quality of data EPA replace upon for NAAQS rulemakings.

Finally, AFPM has concerns about EPA's refinery executive rule, which poses significant cost to industry and the economy with little or no health or environmental benefits.

AFPM supports EPA's process to evaluate the residual risk remaining after full implementation of refinery MACT rules. However, we do not support EPA's implementation of standards applicable to periods of startup (strapped down) and malfunction, the plain provisions of the rule or the new fenceline monitoring regulations, all of which impose significant compliance cost despite EPA is now showing very low levels of risk.

We urge EPA to act on pending petition for reconsideration and to reject petition for reconsideration filed by various environmental groups challenging the work practice standards for pressure relief devices and emergency flaring.

Thank you for this opportunity.

Andrea Drinkard: Thank you very much, Tim.

Operator, if you could open the next line please.

Operator: Our next comment comes from the line of Paul Noe with the American Forest and Paper Association.

Paul Noe: Thank you and good afternoon. I am the vice president for Public Policy at AF&PA. AF&PA serves to advance the sustainable U.S. pulp, paper packaging, tissue and wood products manufacturing industry through a fact-based public policy and marketplace advocacy.

The forest products industry accounts for about 4 percent of U.S. manufacturing GDP, manufactures over \$200 billion in products annually and

employs about 900,000 hardworking men and women often in small rural communities.

Today I want to call your attention to a very long-standing rulemaking that's been 25 years in the making -- EPA's Boiler MACT Rules. This rulemaking was about completed by the last administration, but unfortunately faced the court, remand in July of 2016. The court vacated certain limits in the rule. And now EPA has to complete the job and get this rule put to bed.

We would ask that the agency get a proposed Boiler MACT Rule out within six months to recalculate the few remaining limits that need to be done pursuant to the court. And that this is important for regulatory certainty and to finally close the chapter on this rulemaking, which is I said has been over 25 years in the making.

Thank you.

Andrea Drinkard: Thank you, Paul.

Operator, could you open the next line please?

Operator: Our next comment comes from the line of Leila Ghaznavi with Carnegie Hall.

Leila Ghaznavi: Hello. I am writing to strongly or calling to strongly endorse the EPA's current regulations. I grew up at Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, a state that has been the heart of the steel industry.

Before the EPA, the -- is completely unlivable. People had to wear one set of clothes to work and carry their work clothes work with them in a bag because the soot that was in the air would coat their clothes before they ever made it to their desk.

Asthma and other breathing-related issues were a significant health issue for the entire city. Even today, the enactment of the EPA major clean efforts for the city, you can still see the building staying black from the soot of those factories. And while that soot is a (marker pride) of our industrial roots, it is

also a visible reminder of the importance and the impact that the EPA has had on the health and wellbeing of the city.

Pittsburgh is now considered one of the most livable cities in the nation, a far cry from its poor regard in the 60's and 70's. This evolution would not have happened without the EPA.

And for those who would say that Pittsburgh has suffered from the change and evolution of the steel industry, I will counter that EPA did not damage the steel industry by requiring factories to reduce their emissions. It was the investment of technology in Japanese steel. Our lack of investment in U.S. technology combined with the reliance on import taxes to (dull) competition for American steel in the U.S. that ultimately hobbled Pittsburgh steel industry.

Today, Pittsburgh is a thriving city with a sound economic base and technology and a center for healthcare innovation. I am thankful to the EPA that the fact that my niece and nephew will grow up in Pittsburgh never seeing a city sunrise and can go to school in the same clothes that they left their homes in.

The EPA has had a profound and an important impact on the health and wellbeing of Americans. I strongly oppose any effort to reduce minimize or negate the effectiveness of its important work. Thank you very much.

Andrea Drinkard: Thank you, Leila.

Operator, if you can open the next line please?

Operator: Our next comment comes from the line of Christine Pratt with Seattle City Light.

(Off-mic)

Kate Engel: Hello. This is actually Kate Engel with Seattle City Light. Can you hear me?

Andrea Drinkard: Yes, we can hear you. Go ahead. Kate?

Kate Engel: Oops. Seattle City Light provides electricity to Seattle's residential, commercial and industrial customers by generating 90 percent of energy through hydroelectric operations.

The impacts of climate change on mountain snowpack and glaciers that supply much of the water for our projects poses a threat to Seattle and the region's ability to continue to prosper in the coming years.

The effects of climate change have already been felt. In a warming climate, extreme events like storms, floods, droughts, wildfires, landslides and longer, more intense heat waves are likely to become more frequent. These changes threaten the snowpack and river flows that we depend on as well as on Seattle City Light's infrastructure and operations.

We have supported EPA's work on climate change and written an oral comments including the support of the endangerment findings, the greenhouse gas, tailoring rule, the Clean Power Plan and other proposed regulations for new and existing electric power plants. We maintain our position and believe that addressing climate change through regulating emissions of greenhouse gases is an urgent and vitally important action.

The city of Seattle and Seattle City Light have been long time advocates for federal action on climate change. We believe the EPA should continue the work of addressing climate change through the Office of Air and Radiation given the compelling scientific findings and evidence of climate change already occurring.

Thank you.

Andrea Drinkard: Thank you, Kate.

Operator, could you open the next line please?

Operator: Our next comment comes from the line of James Enstrom.

James Enstrom: Hello. My name is Dr. James E. Enstrom. I have a doctoral level training in both physics and the epidemiology, and for the past 44 years I have conducted high-quality peer-reviewed epidemiologic research at UCLA. I am asking EPA to reassess and modify the National Ambient Air Quality Standard for fine particulate matter.

On March 28th, I published a major peer-reviewed article showing that PM2.5 is not related to total mortality or premature deaths in the United States. This null relationship, which is based on my analysis of the large 1982 American Cancer Society Cancer Prevention Study cohort, contradicts the positive relationship in the same cohort that was published in 1995 by Pope. And that was the primary justification for the establishment of the PM2.5 NOX by EPA in 1997.

The difference in findings occurred because the 1995 Pope analysis used inferior PM2.5 measurements and used only a selected portion of the available ACS data. My findings are also supported by the null findings in a 2016 article that analyzed the large National NIH AARP cohort.

My independent analysis of the otherwise still secret ACS data demonstrates the importance of basing EPA regulations on transparent and reproducible science as required by the HONEST Act. H.R. 1340 has been approved by the House of Representatives and is awaiting action in the Senate.

Since March 10th, I have requested that Pope, Krewski and the Health Effects Institute confirm my null findings, and they have provided no evidence that my findings are incorrect. Thus, EPA must immediately reassess the validity of the PM2.5 NOX and all regulations such as the Clean Power Plan that are justified by alleged PM2.5-related premature deaths.

The initial focus must be on my new findings on the apparently incorrect findings of Pope, Krewski and HEI and on the extensive evidence that healthy levels of PM2.5 have already been achieved in America. EPA must not approve any further (inaudible) waivers, state implementation plans or air quality management plans until this PM2.5 NOX reassessment has been made.

Thank you very much for your consideration. I will be submitting written comments to supplement these verbal comments.

Andrea Drinkard: Thank you very much, James.

Operator, would you open the next line please?

Operator: Our next comment comes from the line of Giedrius Ambrozaitis with Alliance of Auto Manufacturers.

Giedrius Ambrozaitis: Yes, hello. My name is Giedrius Ambrozaitis. I am speaking on behalf of the Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers. The Auto Alliance is a trade association that represents the interest of the 12 largest automobile manufacturers in the United States, representing 70 percent of all car and light truck sales in the United States. Thank you for the opportunity to speak today.

On this call, we would like to state that the alliance appreciates further opportunity to provide input on President Trump's Executive Order 13777 and how the Office of Air and Radiation can review, repeal, replace and modify regulations to make them less burdensome.

We are looking forward to submitting our written comments to the docket. Thank you very much.

Andrea Drinkard: Thank you, Giedrius.

Operator, if you could open the next line please?

Operator: Our next comment comes from the line of Aminah Zaghab with Environment America.

Aminah Zaghab: Hello. Thank you for this opportunity. My name is Aminah Zaghab, and I am with Environment America, a federation of 29 state-based environmental organizations working for clean air, clean water and open space.

On that note, we are very concerned with potential rollbacks to our EPA protections, climate safeguards, protect our health, conserve our resources and save lives with benefits that far exceed the cost of compliance year after year.

The Clean Air Act alone prevents more than 160,000 premature deaths and 1.7 million asthma attacks every year, delivering up to \$90 in public benefits for every dollar invested in clean air. In particular, we're very concerned with the tax to the Clear Power Plan and the Clean Car Standards.

The EPA's Clean Power Plan represents the most significant steps the U.S. has taken to address the urgent threat of climate change. And the EPA's Clean Cars and Trucks Standards are essential for protecting public health and the environment. In fact, the Clean Car and Fuel Economy Standards currently in place are second to none in terms of policies that reduce transportation carbon pollution, our current top emitter, and reduce our dependence on costly oil.

In fact, the EPA reports that the Car Greenhouse Gas Standards in place through just 2012 have already avoided 160 metric tons of carbon pollution while at the same time saving consumers over \$35 billion at the gas pump. This is the progress that we need to continue rather than weaken.

Thank you very much for this opportunity. And we hope to see these standards protected.

Andrea Drinkard: Thank you, Aminah.

Operator, would you open the next line please?

Operator: Certainly. Our next comment comes from the line of Henry Frey with North Carolina State.

Henry Frey: Thank you. I'm speaking as a private citizen. EPA is required under the Clean Air Act to develop and implement standards and cannot simply repeal them. The setting of emission standards where there's New Source Performance Standards, National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air

Pollutants, Mobile Source Standards, et cetera, entails usually a lengthy rulemaking process with technical support documents, public comment, EPA response to comment and, in many cases, also a regulatory impact analysis that assesses benefits and cost.

So these are deliberative processes. They are generally not arbitrary and capricious.

With regard to the Clean Power Plan, EPA is obligated to act as a result of an endangerment finding some years ago that's based on scientific evidence of adverse effects of greenhouse gas emissions. EPA cannot simply disregard that endangerment finding and is obligated to take action under the Clean Air Act. The existing standards having been promulgated with regard to a lawful process cannot simply be set aside, and to do so arbitrarily and capriciously would invite tremendous number of lawsuits.

I'll also comment on the National Ambient Air Quality Standards that several commenters have talked about. EPA is required to set health protective standards, but the language in the Clean Air Act is they must protect public health with an adequate margin of safety and that the standards must be science-based and reviewed every five years.

According to a 2001 Supreme Court case, it is simply illegal for EPA to consider cost and technical feasibility of attaining a NAAQS when setting the NAAQS. So the NAAQS are really the only standard in the U.S. that is purely based on public health.

EPA is required to have an external body of experts, review the scientific basis of the NAAQS and so the NAAQS process is explicitly science-based. And in contrast to some of the comments we've heard, those rulemakings do not rely on a single study. They rely on the overall weight of evidence of the body of scientific literature, not a single study. For example, the revised Ozone Act, which some people are calling for setting aside, cannot simply be undone without a science-based rulemaking process. And for two revision cycles of the Ozone standard, the Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee

has advised the administrator that the standard is not protective of public health unless set at levels in the 60 to 70 ppb range.

So furthermore, the effectiveness of existing emission regulations, which some commenters had pointed out, means it will become easier to attain the Ozone NAAQS.

And very briefly, I just want to emphasize that environmental regulations do not kill jobs. They may redistribute benefits and cost, but they don't lead to a net reduction in employment. And as others have pointed out, we've had tremendous economic growth since 1970 when the EPA was formed.

Andrea Drinkard: Operator, would you...

(Crosstalk)

Andrea Drinkard: ...line please?

Henry Frey: ...the benefits of the Clean Air...

Operator: Our next comment comes from the line of Ron Sober with RFS Consulting Inc.

Ron Sober: My name is Ron Sober. I'm a licensed environmental engineer and president of RFS Consulting, Inc. We're a small independent environmental engineering and consulting company, which assists sort of the industries and permitting compliance, recordkeeping reporting regarding the environmental rules and have over the past 40 years.

In this effort, I'm immersed in rules and regulations, some of which makes sense and some of which do not. As such, I'd like to offer the following comments on a handful of regulations or policies, which deserve reconsideration or modification.

40 CFR Part 98, pertaining to greenhouse gas emission reporting, no underlying rule or standard or limit governing reported emissions. We're

talking about non-criteria pollutants, non-regulated pollutants not required by the Clean Air Act of 1990 with no clear purpose for data being generated. This imposes a significant cost of regulated community for which there is no tangible benefit while not overly cumbersome to some industry sectors or equipment.

Sub Part W specifically pointed to the oil and gas industry imposes significant burden, which this industry type has multiple pieces of equipment, which must be tracked, monitored, data compiled just to determine if reporting threshold is triggered. This effort results in a significant financial burden whether reporting is required or not.

Second point is related to 40 CFR Part 63 MACT Standard in the “Once in, always in” policy. This policy by itself undermines any incentive to reduce emissions of hazardous air pollutants to below a trigger point and creates an unnecessary burden on continued compliance. There’s no incentive to accept restrictions or modify operations to become a synthetic miner source. And the policy itself creates a burden on those desiring to reduce hazardous air pollutants since there is no benefit in doing so. The burden of reporting continues indefinitely with the cost being reported, generated and submitted to the regulatory agency only in, always in policy.

I have other comments. My time is up. I will be submitting written comments in the docket. Thank you.

Andrea Drinkard: Thank you very much, Ron.

Operator, would you open the next line please?

Operator: Our next -- our next comment comes from the line of (Don Giardinini) with Equipment Company and (Cardinal Manufacturer).

(Don Giardinini): Thank you very much. My name is (Don Giardinini). I’m one of the designated EPA Compliance team members with (Cardinal Manufacturing). It’s an engineering with (higher equipment) company (inaudible) engine distribution.

My comment is regarding 40 CFR Part 1060.1 through 1060.825, control of evaporative emissions from new and end-use non-road and stationary equipment specifically with category engines defined in 40 CFR Part 1054, control of emissions from new small non-road spark ignition engines and equipment, which specifically designates the N.S. in our S.I. category as the spark ignited engines with a maximum engine power at or below 19 kilowatts.

I asked the Task Force to consider these evaporative emissions regulations as (ineffective) and take appropriate actions directed by this Executive Order. The logic is the permeation standards for fuel tanks and fuel lines, as dictated, represent a very, very small amount of vapor escaping into the environment through the walls of the fuel tank and fuel lines. This specifies them out of 1.5 grams per square meter per day is so small, in fact, specialized equipment is needed to measure.

When this small amount of vapor that permeates through the walls of these components is considered versus the amount of vapor that escapes into the atmosphere, every time the fuel cap is removed to check how much gas is in the small equipment's tank or the cap is removed to fill up the tank, a realistic perspective appears. Several thousand days' worth of this limit is released into the environment each and every time the fuel cap is removed from the tank. Hence, the environment has been protected from nothing. This extremely small amount of vapor has simply been saved in the tank to be released when the fuel cap is removed.

Because the equipment covered here is largely small water pumps, generators, lawn mowers and all the typical small engine powered machines of the world with typically small fuel tanks, I believe if the Task Force considers how they are used in the field and how many times the gas cap is removed, (that then) evaporative emissions is attained by these regulations. This is capable logic, cannot be denied. Therefore, making these evaporative emissions are attractive.

So the burden of the manufacturer to obtain the certificate of compliance, pay the fees, pay the fines when the record keeping is correct and increase the products price in the market to absorb the expense is especially great whether one considers no net gain for the environment is actually attained.

Thank you very much for the opportunity to comment.

Andrea Drinkard: Thank you very much, (Don).

Operator, next line please?

Operator: Our next comment comes from the line of Jerry Hiatt with Nuclear Energy Institute.

Susan Mathiascheck: Hello, this is Susan Mathiascheck. I'm speaking on behalf of NEI, the Nuclear Energy Institute.

Nuclear energy provides by far the largest share of emissions-free electricity in the U.S. today. On behalf of the Nuclear Energy and our other members, NEI appreciates the opportunity to comment on EPA's regulatory review under the Executive Order and supports the agency's effort to examine its regulations and to maintain protection of human health and the environment going forward.

To that end, NEI will be submitting more detailed comments for the docket by May 15th. Thank you.

Andrea Drinkard: Thank you.

Operator, next line please?

Operator: Our next comment comes from the line of Nathaniel Burden with Fidelity.

Female: One second.

Operator: Fidelity Inspections.

Andrea Drinkard: Nathaniel, your line is open. We can -- we -- do you have a comment?

(Off-mic)

Andrea Drinkard: You may be on mute. We can't -- we can't hear you.

All right. Operator, if you'd open the next line please?

Operator: Our next comment comes from the line of Don Hancock with Southwest Research.

Don Hancock: Hello. Southwest Research and Information Center is a private nonprofit organization primarily involved with ARIA's work regarding the Atomic Energy Act and the WIPP Land Withdrawal Act. We also recognize the essential public health and economic benefits of ARIA's regulations related to clean air. We're also very much involved and concerned about public participation and information in the rulemaking process.

Executive Order 13777 that we're discussing today is the result of and a progeny of Executive Order 13777. That Executive Order Section 3A states that each agency's best approximation of the total cost or savings associated with each new regulation or repealed regulation is required.

Our concerns are that the cost calculations should include quantifying the health effects on existing populations of new and modified or repealed regulations. The cost calculation should include the cost and benefits to President Trump and his family's businesses and other related costs.

The Regulatory Reform Task Force that EPA has should also be identifying regulations that haven't been issued or not enforced that are required by existing law, not just new or existing regulations.

Furthermore, in terms of public transparency, the cost of the regulatory task force should be publicly disclosed and all of the reports of the regulatory task force should be publicly available on the EPA and ARIA's websites. Thank you.

Andrea Drinkard: Thank you, Don.

Operator, would you open the next line please?

Operator: Our next comment comes from the line of Nadia Steinzor with Earthworks.

Nadia Steinzor: Yes, hello. I am speaking on behalf of Earthworks, a nonprofit organization that focuses on oil and gas issues and protecting communities from the negative impacts of those industries.

I speak today both as someone with asthma and as a researcher who has documented the air pollution and health impacts caused by the oil and gas industry and how communities pay the price with their health, quality of life and property values.

A growing body of scientific evidence demonstrates these facts, including through 100s of peer reviewed studies. Nothing should be done to roll back the new federal rules to control oil and gas air pollution finalized under President Obama.

The U.S. uses over \$1 billion worth of natural gas every year through methane leaks and intentional releases throughout the oil and gas system. This is enough natural gas to meet the heating and cooking needs of over 5 million American homes. These common sense regulations that have been put in place after painstaking and lengthy public review and comment would solve this problem.

Methane pollution is a grave threat to global climate and to air quality and health. Methane emissions caused pollution hitchhikers as well, stemming leaks and releases of methane with lower emissions of pollutions like nitrogen oxides which form ozone and smog and harm health.

Data clearly show that its oil and gas operations have expanded so to have the pollution it caused. Several years into the shale gas and oil boom, the Obama administration realized that it was high time for change.

Any attempted rollbacks by the Trump administration would fly in the face of this extensive public and scientifically based process and would be nothing less than payoff to oil and gas corporations for their financial support during the election, and (the vast) upfront to the public. Thank you very much, and we will submit written comments as well.

Andrea Drinkard: Thank you very much, Nadia. Operator, would you open the next line, please?

Operator: Yes. Our next comment comes from the line of Vince Brisini with Olympus Power.

Vince Brisini: Thank you. It's very important for EPA to reconsider repetitive regulatory obligations and onerous and excessive testing monitoring and reporting requirements that only serve to add unnecessary cost.

Also, in establishing regulatory obligation, EPA needs to use the most current and the best available information rather than relying upon outdated emissions inventories that result in inflated representations of impacts and benefits.

And benefits should not be double counted between regulations by considering them independently. EPA and other regulators cannot rely upon conjecture when representing environmental impacts. It appears to be occurring in a recent draft regional haze report for the Northeast.

So, the important facts to consider are, for example, the 43 of the 50 ozone monitors in Pennsylvania have already measured attainment of the 2015 standard using the 2014 through 2016 data.

And this is occurring prior to Pennsylvania, Reasonably Available Control Technology 2, the national mobile source NOx reductions from the implementation of tier 3 gasoline and implementation of the ozone season nitrogen oxide Cross-State Air Pollution Rule update, all of which became effective in 2017.

Nationally, some of the electric generating unit emissions reductions that have occurred between 2002 and 2016 are an 85.4 percent reduction in sulfur dioxide, 72.8 percent reduction in annual nitrogen oxide emissions, a 70.2 percent in ozone season nitrogen oxide emissions and a 74.7 percent reduction in non-ozone season emissions. Thank you for the opportunity to make this statement.

Andrea Drinkard: Thank you very much, Vince. Operator, would you open the next line, please?

Operator: Our next comment comes from the line of Gloria Linnertz with Citizen For Radioactive Radon Reduction

Gloria Linnertz: Hello. My name is Gloria, and I am President and Founder of Citizens for Radioactive Radon Reduction. The drastic act of removing the funding for the State Indoor Radon Grant and cutting the EPA radon program would take the lives of American people.

A few people know about the invisible killer that maybe in their home schools or workplaces but the discontinuance of the outreach efforts of the state radon programs no one will know. And that elevated levels of radioactive radon gas have been found in every state and in our nation including yours.

There is no federal or state law that requires radon testing at the time of the home that's purchased therefore many people were never aware that they've been living with this silent killer in their schools and homes and work places until they are diagnosed with lung cancer.

How can our government be so insensitive and humane to eliminate the efforts to educate their citizens about the leading environmental causes of cancer mortality? Eleven years ago when my -- when the oncologist told my husband, and he got lung cancer, it would take his life, we had no idea that we have been living with this invisible killer radon for 18 years because our society is so ignorant of the danger of this gas that cannot be seen, smelled or tasted. No one seems to care about those of us who have been robbed of our loved ones and our lives.

We have a government to protection for us, not just on the battlefields but in our indoor environment as well. The cause of lung cancer treatments amounts to 100s of 1,000s of dollars per patient.

And there is only a 15 percent to 17 percent five-year survival rate. In contrast, the typical home can be (at a) mitigation system installed \$4,000 or \$1,500 if they are aware of the danger.

State and federal staffing and program grants are essential for the government's moral, duty, legal obligation and of risk reduction to our American public.

I urge the members of Congress to ensure the continued existence of a fully funded radon program in EPA to protect our citizens against this leading environment cause of cancer mortality, this radioactive killer. They have the power and opportunity to save these lives 21,000 a year. You can make a difference.

The federal law, the Indoor Radon Abatement Act was passed in 1988, which it stated the government would protect the citizens from radon gas with state radon programs providing education and awareness. Please don't go back on your word, your actions, to support this critical live-saving program is vital. Thank you very much.

Andrea Drinkard: Thank you very much, Gloria. Operator, would you open the next line, please?

Operator: Our next comment comes from the line of Jeff Arnold.

Jeff Arnold: Hi. I am...

(Off-Mic)

Jeff Arnold: ... representation of a new organization. I came to this process today. That has been extremely enlightening in how the new administration is completely

curtailing in cunning out public comments by reducing this to a three-hour conference call on a Monday in which no working person would be able to attend reasonably without being an activist in the space or a representative of a major corporate interest. This is not only unfair. It should really be (outright)...

(Off-Mic)

Jeff Arnold: My concern is that the repeal of the Clean Air and Water Act will essentially have huge implications disproportionately affecting people based on cost and rates because those who have least ability to afford moving will be most impacted by environmental concerns nearby them.

Externalities are not well accounted for in the free market and there is no effective means of combating that without regulation in our current marketplace. Acknowledging that, in tandem with acknowledging the fact that there is a massive subsidization of the entire fuel industry when you account for tax write-offs for exploration and processing, we literally have put trillions of dollars of subsidization into these industries that have distorted the free market value of what they provide and have ignored the health costs that are rampant surrounding this work.

If we truly had equal terms, sustainable and low impact energy, we'd be way ahead and it already is in terms of job production. I am merely an individual with a background in economics contributing this information. I am horrified, absolutely horrified at the generate level of contribution you have seen from reps from industry who have seemingly no concern about the massive sweeping of deleterious effects that are about to be suffered nationwide should this repeal happen in the way it is about to happen. Thank you for your time.

Andrea Drinkard: Thank you very much, Jeff. Operator, would you open the next line, please?

Operator: Certainly. And as a reminder, if you would like to make a comment, please star-1 on your telephone keypad. Our next comment comes from the line of (Jim Spitz).

(Jim Spitz): Hello. I would like to question the calculus being used by the EPA here in this Executive Order in assessing costs and benefits particularly in regard to climate change and the rules most directly relevant here are the Clean Power Plan and methane abatement rule and the fuel efficiency standards.

We need to be absolutely clear that if scientists are anything close to correct than the regulatory burden of failure to bring in climate change under control will be far beyond anything in the experience of human civilization.

The burden of having an atmosphere that consists of 410 parts per million carbon dioxide, the number that is rapidly increasing will vastly exceed anything that any industry representative could possibly complain about.

I live in Gatlinburg, Tennessee where we were just burdened with a wildfire last November which was a result of the driest autumn in memory. That would not happen in the normal climate. That is a burden imposed on us by the EPA's failure to regulate greenhouse gases.

I think we must also call attention to the elephants in the room here that we have an EPA administrator who has publicly and with impunity contradicted the basic scientific understanding of climate change. This is unacceptable. The EPA cannot make policy based on fiction.

In the future, the American Southwest will be burdened by a permanent drought. Anyone living within three feet of the ocean will be burdened by a sea level rise. This can't be ignored by EPA. It must move ahead with the Clean Power Plan and the methane abatement rule and the fuel efficiency standards.

I ask EPA to please disregard the objections of industry that are absolutely inconsequential and insignificant by comparison. Thank you.

Andrea Drinkard: Thank you very much, (Jim). Operator, next line, please?

Operator: Our next comment comes from the line of Sarah Fields with Uranium Watch.

Sarah Fields: Hello. I am concerned that the current administration of EPA are more concerned about the burdens of regulations on profit-making industries rather than the health and social burdens on their citizens particularly those at risk.

I also need to respond to a comment about how nuclear power is an emissions-free industry, it certainly is not. The nuclear industry relies on fossil fuel at every stage of the nuclear fuel's chain from the point of exploration for uranium, uranium mining and milling, manufacturing of nuclear fuel, construction and operation of reactors and the handling and disposal of nuclear wastes. Of course, we still do not have a final solution to the disposition of high-level nuclear wastes, so the EPA doesn't have a basis for evaluating those impacts.

The nuclear industry also includes emission of radioactive and hazardous materials. The EPA is a regulatory agency. Regulatory agencies must have a document control system that ensures the permitting documents are made readily available to the public electronically and in a timely manner.

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission does that with their ADAMS electronic reading room, which is a good example of how public documents should be made available in a timely manner.

I am concerned about the lack of current health research related to radioactive emissions and impacts on community. I also would like the EPA to increase its oversight over state programs that implement the Clean Air Act.

The EPA should conduct timely regulatory reviews of state programs at least every two or three years and provide public input in those reviews. I shouldn't have to go to the EPA to get the EPA to tell the state of Utah that they -- what to do.

(Crosstalk)

Andrea Drinkard: Your line is still up.

(Off-Mic)

Sarah Fields: Does that signal that I am done?

Andrea Drinkard: You have about 15 seconds left.

Sarah Fields: Oh. OK. I'm very concerned too about the EPA Subpart W rulemaking for radon emissions from uranium mills. And the indifference and lack of concern for the public that live in the vicinity of uranium recovery facilities does not bode well for further decisions by the Office of Air and Radiation.

Andrea Drinkard: Thank you, Sarah. Your time is up. Operator, would you open the next line, please?

Operator: Our next comment comes from the line of Sarita Hudson with Partners for a Healthier Community.

Sarita Hudson: Hi, this is Sarita Hudson. I am the Director of Programs and Development for Partners for a Healthier Community, the public health institute of Western Massachusetts. And I convene the Pioneer Valley Asthma Coalition.

In Springfield, Massachusetts, fully 1/5 of our students have asthma. It's even higher in Holyoke, Massachusetts where 30 percent of kids have asthma. Asthma has been directly linked to air pollution, and in particular, to clean -- to power, the particulate matter that comes from power plants and to traffic-based air pollution.

It is critical that we maintain regulations that as we look at regulations that we also look at what is the burden on health and the economic and social impact of health problems related to air quality, whether it's radon, whether it is -- it is from power plants or -- and in particular, we would also consider the air -- indoor air impacts that come from having lead-based paint and other regulations that deal with hazardous substances, radon, lead, asbestos.

It's really critical that in looking at any of these in considering what is burdensome that they -- that there is also a consideration of what are the health impacts on children and what that means in terms of their education

and their productivity as adults and their ability to work and have fulfilled lives.

So, as we look at where the EPA regulations and in particular, those that will drive climate change which again will have serious health impacts and is already starting to show health impacts that we consider that all considerations around those -- any regulations that would have a health impact that that is considered fully as well as any burdens that are on industry -- industries or companies to implement those regulations.

In particular, we would also look at the focus on water quality as we found in Flint, Michigan that the need for regulation of water -- lead and water is critical. So, if anything, there should be even more regulations put into place to avoid the situation like Flint. Thank you very much for this opportunity, and we will be submitting written testimony.

Andrea Drinkard: Thank you very much, Sarita. Operator, would you open the next line, please?

Operator: Our next comment comes from the line of Joseph Pendola with National Steering.

Tony Pendola: Hi, my name is Tony Pendola, I'm the Small Business Ombudsman for the state of North Carolina. But today, I'm here in my role as the Chair of the National Steering Committee for Small Business Environmental Assistance Programs or SBEAPs.

The Clean Air Act requires that each state and territory have someone that can provide free technical assistance and advocacy for small businesses. We work with OAQPS and other EPA groups. We greatly appreciate this opportunity and we'll follow up with written comments.

We have been providing comments to EPA for many years and we'll repeat a few today that has not gained any traction. I would be remised if I didn't mention our strong desire for greater interaction with the Office of Air Quality

Planning and Standards as we have significant state-specific expertise and regulatory reform.

We would like to see EPA rescind the "once in, always in" guidance policy since it discourages emission reductions and assist states with large biogenic sources of VOCs in efficiently determining at the summertime gasoline RVP standard can be rescinded as it has been in North Carolina, Florida, Alabama and Pennsylvania. And this could result in saving billions of dollars for drivers and reducing refinery emissions.

One of the rules I'd like to talk about today is the auto body NESHAP or 6H. After the rule became effective, all of the major paint manufacturers reformulated their traditional automotive paints to all but eliminate those containing the heavy metals targeted by the rule.

Unfortunately, this is perhaps the only rule of its kind that assumes an entire sector consisting of 10s of 1,000s of auto body shops uses products containing these heavy metals. If the regulation were modified to treat auto body shops like all other facilities subject to this regulation and then the shops would no longer be automatically covered. In fact, hardly any of them use those materials any more. They would only be covered if they use them that contain the target heavy metals as laid out in the applicability section.

Another rule we'd like to discuss is the NSPS for petroleum dry cleaners. Comments were previously submitted and noted how this rule should not apply to newer dry to dry technologies. An applicability determination was issued on November 17th of 2015 by Region 4 stating that for the first time that newer dry to dry machines are not covered by the definition of petroleum dry cleaner.

Very few of the 10s of 1,000s of owners of these machines are aware of this dramatic change in interpretation. This significant of a change needs to be codified in the regulation itself and can be done by simply changing a definition. Thank you for the opportunity.

Andrea Drinkard: Thank you, Tony. Operator, would you open the next line, please.

Operator: Our next comment comes from the line of Angela Tin with American Lung Association. Angela, your line is open.

Angela Tin: Hello, my name is Angela Tin, and I am Vice President of the -- of Environmental Health for the American Lung Association of the Upper Midwest. Thank you for allowing us to speak today. I will also be providing written comments.

Radon is a colorless, odorless and tasteless gas that comes from the breakdown of naturally occurring uranium in the soil. The location of greatest exposure to radon is in the home. Radon can enter homes through cracks and other pathways in the foundation.

Any home can have radon regardless of new or old construction. Radon is a known human carcinogen that can cause lung cancer, is a leading cause of lung cancer among nonsmokers and is responsible for 21,000 lung cancer deaths each year. About 3,000 of these deaths occur from people that have never smoked.

The U.S. Surgeon General says that breathing radon over prolonged periods can prevent -- present a significant health risk to families all over the country. EPA estimates that 13 percent of lung cancer deaths are radon-related and that one in every 15 homes have a high level of radon above the recommended action levels.

We urge EPA to continue to maintain the existing radon program. Radon is a serious problem with a simple solution. The American Lung Association and all of our radon partners are working together to remove radon in our homes, workplaces and community with your support. Thank you for listening to me and your time.

Andrea Drinkard: Thank you, Angela. Operator, would you open the next line, please?

Operator: Our next comment comes from the line of Nathaniel Burden with Fidelity Inspections.

Nathaniel Burden: Yes. Hi. This is Nathaniel Burden from Fidelity Inspection and Consulting Services, also representing the Pennsylvania Board of the American radon scientists and technologists, and following up on the radon issue since radon is a classic carcinogen that caused us 21,000 lung cancer deaths a year.

And as said before that it's the primary cause of lung cancer for nonsmokers, we strongly recommend that the Radon Action Program and the State Indoor Radon Grant program be preserved for risk communication to low income and minority communities.

Also, with the effort of reducing 21,000 lung cancer deaths to by 50 percent would cause a tremendous savings to the overall medical community and impact to the medical community on preventing lung cancer deaths.

So, my final statement is that we need to preserve the Radon Action Program and the SIRG grant in an effort to make sure that especially low income and minority communities are provided the proper information which they have not been. Thank you.

Andrea Drinkard: Thank you, Nathaniel. Operator, would you open the next line, please?

Operator: Our next comment comes from the line of Gail Payne with Sierra Club.

Gail Payne: Hi, my name is Gail Payne and I'm the Nuclear Issues Chair of Sierra Club Long Island group. I am an unpaid volunteer, unlike most of the callers who want regulations weakened.

A recent caller that nuclear energy provides emission-free energy, this is untrue. Nuclear reactors release many types of radioactive emissions through day-to-day operations. If the caller was referring to carbon emissions, construction, maintenance, decommissioning and the processing of fuel and waste all have carbon emissions that exceed any renewable source.

Now, for my comment, the EPA was created for the purpose of protecting human health and the environment by writing and enforcing regulations based

on laws passed by Congress. I'd like to comment on a subject of repealing or modifying radiation standards to make them less burdensome.

I assume this means less burdensome to business, but do you know what is really burdensome to millions of Americans, cancer, asthma and birth defects. I am all for modifying the radiation standards to make them less of a health burden to you as citizens.

Permitted levels for radiation exposure were raised a few years ago, probably in response to the massive amount of radiation released by Fukushima. The incidence of cancer continues to rise worldwide in tandem with rising levels of manmade background radiation.

Background radiation has risen 600 percent since the start of the atomic age. The U.S. ranks sixth highest out of 50 countries in cancer incidents. Our allowable limits of radiation have been based on an arbitrary risk to an adult male.

However, women and children are much more sensitive than men to radiation. This means women like me and children like mine will be unduly burdened. There is no safe dose of radiation. All the reports of the National Academy of Science affirmed the no safe dose findings.

EPA, please, do not relax standards to either radiation or air pollution, when they should, in fact, be improved. That's it, thank you.

Andrea Drinkard: Thank you very much, Gail. Operator, next line, please?

Operator: Our next comment comes from the line of (Carrie Hugo).

(Carrie Hugo): Hello. Thank you for this opportunity to comment on implementation of Executive Order 13777. Firstly, I would like to thank the civil servants working for the EPA to help protect public health and our environment. Your work is often unrecognized, and sadly, it has become a habit for the hard work of civil servants to be a target for frustrations of those who would rather not

be burdened with the regulatory requirements that safeguard our air, water and food.

I have reviewed our nation's air status report for 2015 on the EPA website. This report indicates that despite a growing population, many of the harmful pollutants that affect our air, our climate, our health and our ecosystems are decreasing in much of the United States.

And while there's always room for improvement, we (are comforting) to see that the current regulations are clearly having a positive impact on our air quality and decreasing our exposure to pollutants.

Air pollutants in some categories have decreased by as much as 99 percent. It is very difficult to argue with the effectiveness of these results. Thus, I would question the reasoning behind reducing or eliminating these protections.

Finding efficiencies within an organization makes sense under any business scenario by reducing resources and changing regulations to the point that the EPA can no longer implement its own mission makes no sense.

The mission of the EPA is not to stimulate the economy or to reduce the regulatory burden on industry or special interest. The mission of the EPA is, "to protect human health and the environment."

I urge the EPA to temper the desire to stimulate the economy by relaxing the regulations that have helped the agency achieve the positive results that can be measured so far and the future results that will further protect their air quality even as our population grows.

Currently, renewable energy jobs outnumbered those in the fossil fuel industry and the trend for renewable energy sector is increasing while jobs provided by the fossil fuel industry are decreasing, which is the trajectory that needs to continue in order to reduce the impacts of climate change and protect public health.

The Clean Air Act, the Clean Power Plan and other regulations that impact air quality actually stimulate the economy and to grow in a way that will bring our country closer to sustainable and energy independence, sustainability and better health.

A dirty economy that causes us to move backwards and air quality and increases the presence of pollutants in our environment cannot help those who are suffering from the health effects caused by pollutants including asthma, various cancers and respiratory illness.

Any reduction or elimination in regulations, a reduction in staff to implement and enforce them that is based on cost savings down to implementation of Executive Order 13777 should include an in-depth economic analysis of how those potential savings to industry may actually result in higher cost to the consumer through higher healthcare cost, lost of quality of quality of life and cost associated with mitigating the negative impact of decreased air quality and increased toxic pollutants.

Any reduction or appeal of regulations that can...

Andrea Drinkard: Operator, would you open the next line, please?

Operator: Our next comment comes from the line of Edward Smith with General Aviation. OK,
Edward, your line is open. You may be on mute. We're still not hearing you, Edward. Your line is open.

Edward Smith: Can you hear me? Can you hear me?

Andrea Drinkard: Yes, yes , we can hear you.

Edward Smith: All right. On March 6th of this year, the Council of the International Civil Aviation Organization, ICAO, adopted a new carbon dioxide emission standard for aircraft, the first of such design certification standard among world industry sectors, approved by the 36 emission councils codifies recommendations made by a committee of experts in February 2016.

The standard applies to new aircraft type designs as of 2020 into designs already in production as of 2023. Aircraft that are already in production must meet the standard by 2028 or be sufficiently modified.

This landmark standard was the product of six years of long and arduous work and reflects the cooperation and collaboration among the aviation industry including the general aviation industry, national regulatory authorities and other stakeholders including environmental groups.

The new standard is the product of input from our manufacturers and has our industry support. The new CO₂ standard is one important component of the global aviation manufacturing industry's commitment to do its part to improve its efficiency and mitigate its effect on climate change.

The next step in the process is for national authorities, in the case of the U.S., this means that EPA in cooperation with the FAA to issue regulations implementing the new global standard. The General Aviation Manufacturers Association representing the U.S. and global aviation manufacturing industry urges the U.S. government in the strongest possible terms to develop the appropriate implementing regulations in a timely manner to ensure that U.S. manufacturers are not disadvantaged in the global marketplace.

Failure to implement the new CO₂ standard for U.S. manufacturers would harm their ability to get aircraft certified for operation and sale into markets around the world. This has the potential to seriously harm the competitiveness of one of our nation's most competitive industries and one that provides many 1,000s of well-paying high-tech jobs.

The general aviation industry by itself supports \$219 billion of total economic output and 1.1 million jobs in the United States. Thank you very much.

Andrea Drinkard: Thank you, Edward. Operator, would you open the next line, please?

Operator: Our next comment comes from the line of Lauren Pagel of Earthworks,

Lauren Pagel: Yes, hello. My name is Lauren Pagel. I'm the Policy Director of Earthworks, an organization that protects communities and the environments and the adverse impacts of mineral and energy development.

I'd like to comment on the New Source Performance Standards for methane emissions from the oil and gas industry and urge the EPA to not only keep these important standards in place but rigorously enforce them. These safeguards are more important to protect public -- are important to protect public health and the climate from air pollution that impacts millions of people across the country.

Over 12 million who live within a half mile with an active oil and gas facility and bear the brunt of the health impacting this industry including some 150,000 asthma attacks caused by oil and gas air pollution alone.

In addition to the immediate health impacts of volatile organic compounds like benzene, methane is especially quoted climate pollutant, warming our planet 80 times faster than carbon dioxide over a 20-year time period.

One quarter of the climate disruption we are experiencing today comes from methane pollution. The EPA should be about protecting public health in the environment, not catering to energy companies' desire to pollute more. No clean air regulation should be rescinded or weakened at the behalf of the industry creating the pollution. Thank you.

Andrea Drinkard: Thank you very much, Lauren. Operator, next line, please?

Operator: Our next comment comes from the line of Heidi McAuliffe, American Coatings Association.

Heidi McAuliffe: Thank you. My name is Heidi McAuliffe. I'm with the American Coatings Association. And I want to say thank you, first of all, to EPA for holding these listening sessions. I think it's very good idea to get these kind of comments from a broad spectrum of your audience. We will also submit comments in writing as well.

I'd really like to just address one issue today, and that is the "once in, always in" policy under the NESHAP for source categories. This actually is not even a regulation, it is a policy memorandum that was issued on May 16, 1995 by EPA. It's called the Potential to Emit for MACT Standards -- Guidance on Timing Issues from John Seitz, Director of the Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, OAQPS. And it was issued to the regional division directors.

Pretty much, everybody refers to this policy as the "once in, always in" policy. And I know that it's been referenced at least one or twice already by other commenters. Anyway, the -- under the MACT standards, a major source is defined as a source that has the potential to emit hazardous air pollutants of up to 10 tons per year of any single HAP or 25 tons per year of any combination of HAP.

Sources below this threshold are considered area sources, but under the "once in, always in" policy, a major source may become an area source by limiting its potential to emit these HAPs to below the major source thresholds. But there was a compliance deadline issued under the maximum available control technology standards, which is also called the NESHAP.

If you neglect it or if you fail to achieve that area source standard by the very first compliance deadline then you remain subject to the MACT even if you subsequently reduce your HAPs admissions to below major source levels at any other point in time.

So, as I said, if you don't get your emissions below that particular threshold by the deadline, you're subject to the MACT no matter what efforts you take in the future to reduce your emissions.

The coatings industry has substantially reduced all use of HAPs significantly and we have many, many companies that have or way under this threshold that are not able to get underneath that requirement in the "once in, always in" policy.

We would really appreciate if EPA would reconsider this policy and withdraw or rescind it. It really does not encourage manufacturers to reduce emissions because of this policy. So, we will be submitting comments on this as well and look forward to doing so. Thank you.

Andrea Drinkard: Thank you very much, Heidi. Operator, next line, please?

Operator: Our next comment comes from the line of Melinda Ronca-Battista, Native American Tribe.

Melinda Ronca-Battista: Hi. Thanks for hosting this session. It's really great that the EPA allows public comments on significant changes that may be happening.

I have just a quick comment in a way that could reduce burden and actually increase environmental measurements which is to reduce the burden and requirement for quality assurance project plans for projects that don't even involve gathering data.

This is a great burden for the many small agencies such as tribal agencies. In the past, EPA has required quality assurance project plans for using EPA's own data to draw a conclusion as well as things that obviously don't need a QAP such as literature searches.

So, that's my only comment. I'm hoping to be practical and productive and thank you, EPA, it's the best federal agency we've worked with many. And we appreciate this time to comment, reduce the burden of craps. Thank you.

Andrea Drinkard: Thank you, Melinda. Operator, next line, please?

Operator: Our next comment comes from the line of Christian Peña with Appion Inc.

Christian Peña: Yes, thank you. I'm Christian Peña, Executive Manager of Appion Inc. in Denver, Colorado. Our company manufactures tools and equipment used to recover and capture refrigerants specifically substances known to harm the ozone and equipment and contribute to global climate change.

I'm speaking on my own behalf on the basis of my direct experience with this industry working successfully under EPA regulations for decades. I've been closely involved with the work required to capture, track and manage these substances, procedures that are sometimes associated with added time and cost.

While it would be easier to irresponsibly vent these substances, the impact of such carelessness has been well documented. The smoking gun of manmade substances destroying stratospheric ozone cannot be ignored.

I have heard and read other commenters essentially asking the EPA to rollback regulations because of the concern that it's hard or expensive to protect the environment. They have also been requests to the level of the playing field by finding the lowest common denominator in regulation.

Electrical generation oil and gas industry representatives even here today have acknowledged how incredibly successful they have been even with the continued regulatory oversight of the EPA and therefore show that EPA's actions have not been unnecessary burdens.

If EPA is going to seriously pursue the modification of regulation then it is critically important that decades of work on protecting the environment not be ignored. For each area of regulation that the EPA has enacted on behalf of the American people and our health by way of clean water and clean air, it is necessarily that extensive review occur that meets or exceeds the amount of review that occurred when initially enacting each and every rule.

Public health must remain the first priority above any industry profits. For industries that cannot succeed without harming the environment, the cost to allow them to proceed is simply too high.

Clean water and clean air are the legacy that we must all work towards providing our future generations. While it is certainly possible and reasonable to review and update regulations, it must be done responsibly. Your responsibility is to protect our air and water.

For every rule withdrawn and regulation rolled back without significant irresponsible review to ensure that public health remains a priority, EPA and the current administration will have failed the American people and the world for generations to come. Thank you.

Andrea Drinkard: Thank you, Christian. Operator, next line, please?

Operator: Our next comment comes from the line of (Riley Meyer).

(Riley Meyer): Hello. Can you, guys, hear me?

Andrea Drinkard: Yes, we can hear you.

(Riley Meyer): Wonderful. I'm here to speak about (Vital Point) then. Although it may not be sexy in any particular way, it's something that goes and talked about in many of these issues.

(Vital Point) on the low ANGA estimate of 50 percent of our air. As water temperature rises, they are dying, and with that goes more than 50 percent of the entire world air as well -- as well as the principal food supply of most fish and other -- and the food supply of most of our planets.

We cannot afford to have a lacking EPA, whether you are corporate or if you are -- or if you are a private citizen, it goes about saying that we need (Vital Point) and we need to have the information provided by each corporation to provide EPA regulatory information, otherwise, the EPA cannot react to the pollution of each corporation.

I find over and over again throughout this teleconference that it's much tough that the corporate -- some corporate representation, the economic burdens on them would resolve only in the economic burdens of the American people. That's an incredible over simplification of the issue and it is in the corporation's self interest to persist this (inaudible) that their burdens are synonymous with the American people.

Please look to places like Dish, Texas, promise with jobs (including) industries. They instead receive chemical infused water that cost virtually every citizen millions of dollars in medical bills and plummeting costs of their housing which is the principal form of capital.

None of these are provided in the corporate estimates of projection submitted to these forums. The American people are not considered in these projections because it's not in the corporates' best interest to include them.

This isn't a new story. Dish has existed in many other places from Flint, Michigan to Hinkley California and the ever-burning coal mine of Centralia, Pennsylvania. They're not here necessarily to make jobs. They're here to get as much money as they can in the short term. And I can't fault them for that, but it's up to the EPA to see what they're doing, understand what they're doing and working nimbly to fight against them.

Thank you very much for hearing my words. I hope that you can find something that will -- I hope that you will not repeal the plea, EPA, it is so important. And we've seen 70 percent -- we've seen 69 percent better quality air since the 1970s of the Clean Air Act. It clearly does something and it's something that we valuably need. Thank you.

Andrea Drinkard: Thank you, operator -- thank you, (Riley). Operator, next line, please?

Operator: Certainly. As a reminder, to ask -- to make a comment, please press star-1 on your telephone keypad. Our next comment comes from the line of Ashley Soltysiak with HEAL Utah.

Ashley Soltysiak: Hi, this is Ashley with HEAL Utah. I'm HEAL Policy Director. HEAL Utah is a nonprofit with campaigns focused on clean air, clean energy, nuclear wastes and power policies.

I just like to make a statement today on behalf of my organization and our 15,000 members across the state of Utah. We're based in Salt Lake City, one of the areas in the country with the worse air quality during both the winter for particulate matter -- P.M. 2.5 and ozone in the summer.

This causes some of the highest incidences of asthma, cancer, stroke and exacerbated cardiovascular and respiratory problems and increases mortality rates in our area. It hurts our environment and public health and our capacity for economic growth in the future.

Frankly, the vast majority of improvements to air quality that we've seen in our state have been because of federal air quality standards like tier 2 fuels for vehicles. We need a strong federal oversight, not repeal and replace policy that's focused on short-term business gains at the expense of our families and our environment.

Therefore, we urge the EPA to strengthen the National Ambient Air Quality Standards under the Clean Air Act rather than weaken these critical health standards. In particular, we urge the agency to maintain the current ozone standards and make them even more robust rather than weaken them.

We also urge the continued reinforcement of the Regional Haze Rules which are critical to maintaining the air quality in our five beautiful national parks that are bordered by coal-fired power plants and extensive extractive industries.

Frankly, those of us here in Salt Lake City cannot breathe during our wintertime inversions and our lungs are being burned by excess ozone pollution in the summer. We also have a strong nuclear legacy in the state of Utah and urge the agency to maintain radioactive safeguards.

Ultimately, we believe that this means improving and enforcing EPA's air quality standards which are imperative to maintaining our industries, our diversified economy, improving our public health and working towards healthy and sustainable futures for generations to come. Thank you.

Andrea Drinkard: Thank you, Ashley. Operator, next line, please?

Operator: Our next comment comes from the line of Barry Andrews with Air Quality Services.

Barry Andrews: Thank you. My name is Barry Andrews. I am an air quality consultant with more than 35 years experience in the profession. Ten associates were working for regulatory agencies with multitude of duties including rulemaking activities.

Some of those rulemaking activities include working in tandem with EPA to develop regulations for air emission sources which we knew at the time were inadequately controlled. An example of this was the development of New Source Performance Standards for municipal waste combustors.

Following my experience working with the regulator, I have spent the last 25 years providing consulting to multiple industries including oil and gas companies whose operations are at the upstream, midstream and downstream levels.

During this time, I've seen EPA developed programs that have benefitted both industry and the environment and represent a good example of the things that EPA should pursue. An example of this is the Natural Gas STAR Program.

On the other hand, in recent years, I have seen three examples which I would clearly identify as being overly burdensome to industry. An example of this is the Greenhouse Gas Reporting Program per 40 CFR Part 98 Subpart W.

For the last six years, greenhouse gasses emissions data has been submitted for numerous activities. It is clear from looking at the data year after year that there are just a few activities that represent the vast majority of total greenhouse gas emissions.

Yet, year after year, the industry is required to report for the same activities that were part of the initial rulemaking activity. Following this procedure results much time and effort to account for greenhouse gas emissions that account for a very small percentage of total.

I would encourage EPA to return to their efforts back to what I would describe as a common sense to regulatory activities and seek to identify and focus on

what measures would result in massive environment benefit and at the same time, not overburden industry. Thank you for the opportunity to share my comments.

Andrea Drinkard: Thank you, Barry. Operator, next line, please?

Operator: Our next comment comes from the line of Gary Garrahan with STIHL Incorporated

Gary Garrahan: Thank you. Hello and thank you. STIHL Incorporated is a manufacturer of handheld outdoor power equipments such as chainsaws and leaf blowers. We ask EPA to consider reducing the regulatory burden in situations where one set of regulatory requirements exists for the air emissions resulting from the operation of products while another set of regulations apply to air emissions resulting from the manufacturers; testing of these products.

Specifically, as a manufacturer of gasoline-powered outdoor equipment, we are required to meet the EPA requirements for small non-road engines while at the same time, as a facility, we're required to have a federal air permit due to our potential to emit resulting from the testing of these engines.

Now, bear in mind, we run each engine in our facility for at most a few minutes in order to ensure that it meets emissions requirements while the end-user, the customer, will run that same engine for years to come.

Meeting the small non-road engine requirements ensures that the engines will have low emissions, so maintaining a facility air permit is really unnecessary for both the regulator and the regulated community.

The small non-road engine regulations are focused on reducing emissions, the facility air permit is not. It is really a little more than a database. If EPA can make allowance for situations where as long as manufacturers meet the emission requirements for their products then they would have a reduced burden with regard to air permitting requirements for the facilities in which they produce these products. Thank you.

Andrea Drinkard: Thank you, Gary. Operator, next line, please?

Operator: Our next comment comes from the line of Oscar Paulson with Kennecott Uranium

Oscar Paulson: Thank you, ma'am. My name is Oscar Paulson. I'm a Facility Supervisor at Kennecott Uranium Company, Sweetwater Uranium Project, which is a licenses conventional uranium recovery facility located in Sweetwater Country, Wyoming.

I would like to propose the following two items for repeal under this Executive Order which are as follows. The first is the proposed rule, Health and Environmental Protection Standards for Uranium and Thorium Mill Tailings, Federal Register Volume 82 Number 12, Thursday, January 19, 2017 on the proposed rules.

It is the belief of industry that this proposed rule directed primarily against in-situ uranium recovery operations is not justified by the risks post by these operations specifically because these operations conduct their activities with an exempted portions of...

(Off-Mic)

Oscar Paulson: The second item that I would like to propose for repeal would be the final rule Revisions to National Emission Standards for Radon Emissions from Operating Mill Tailings. This is listed under Federal Register Volume 82 Number 10, Tuesday, January 17, 2017 under rules and regulations.

It is the belief of industry that this final rule is again, not justified by the very minimal risks post by the types of operations it regulates or attempts to regulate specifically uranium mill tailings impoundments, evaporation ponds at licensed uranium recovery facilities and uranium heap leach pads because this type of facilities are as a general rule located in very, very remote areas, and as such, don't post great risks or hazards to general public.

We also intend to submit written comments as well by the deadline. And thank you for allowing me this opportunity to comment.

Andrea Drinkard: Thank you very much, Oscar. Operator, next line, please?

Operator: Our next comment comes from the line of Paul Balserak with American Iron and Steel.

Paul Balserak: Hi, my name is Paul Balserak and I work for the American Iron and Steel Institute. AISI serves as the voice of the North American steelmakers, are 19-member companies and 125 associate members, represent real men and women across America who work in the job of steel production and manufacturing.

The steel industry has been hit by significant cost of job losses over the past years. We care deeply about our environment, and as an industry, have worked very hard to significant reduce our emissions and energy use over the past decades.

We also care deeply though about the work of men and women in the steel industry who have families they most care for. Their lives are generally harmed by the routine and significant cost and delays in projects at their plans from the federal air permitting regulations.

We are very encouraged by this opportunity for evaluation of current regulations. We want to maintain a clean environment around our plants but often find the way air rules are implemented results in real challenges to U.S. production of steel and the competitive world market.

We hope in particular that there will be a focus on streamlining the new source review programs such as allowing routine maintenance at plants to be completed more quickly and easily without unnecessary delays.

We also hope that EPA could make improved modeling tools a higher priority. While we appreciate the recent Appendix W Air Dispersion Final Rule, we would hope that the rule could be changed in -- to enhance particular

areas would receive widespread comment during EPA's work on this recent final rule.

When the timing of air permit decisions by the federal government, not the actual air standards themselves at the facility but the timing of getting a permanent modification itself to process becomes a key deciding factor in major financial decisions on whether to expand the given plant.

There's something wrong with the way the air rules are being implemented. We appreciate this opportunity and look forward to work closely with the agency in public news and common process as we continue to enhance our environment and the way the air permit rules work. Thank you very much.

Andrea Drinkard: Thank you, Paul. Operator, next line, please?

Operator: Our next comment comes from the line of Nancy Kirner with Health Physics Society

Nancy Kirner: Hello. My name is Nancy Kirner and I'm past President of the Health Physics Society and Chair of its Scientific and Public Issues Committee. HPS is the professional organization of specialists and radiation safety and we thank you for this opportunity to express our concerns.

First, the HPS appreciates the efforts of the EPA in protecting public health and the environment. We've had an exemplary working relationship with EPA and we hope that we'll continue well into the future.

Today, our primary regulatory concern is EPA's apparent reliance on the linear non-threshold hypothesis, LNT, especially at low doses and low-dose rates without consideration for the uncertainty of estimated health effects at low doses.

This reliance tends to foment the public's irrational fear of all types of radiation. This adherence to LNT goes against the International Commission on Radiation Protection Report Number 103, which states in part, corrected effective dose is not intended as a tool for epidemiological risk assessment

and it's inappropriate to use it in risk projections. In particular, the calculation of the number of cancer deaths based on collective effective doses from trivial individual doses should be avoided.

The HPS has a similar position statement called radiation risk perspective available at www.hps.org. It recommends against estimating health risks when exposures to ionizing radiation are near or less than natural background levels especially when doses are less than 100 millisievert from all non-background sources.

The following EPA documents could be improved to better address these uncertainties, the EPA assessment of risks from radon in homes especially.

Federal Guidance Reports Number 11, 12 and 13, EPA radiogenic cancer risk models and projection for the U.S. population also known as the Blue Book and...

(Off-Mic)

Nancy Kirner: ...radionuclide tables, radionuclide, carcinogenicity slope factors.

And, of course, all of this gets embodied into 10 CFR 190 and 40 -- excuse me, that was 40 CFR 190 and 40 CFR 192. These could be reduced with additional epidemiological research to better quantify potential effects of low level radiation exposures.

We look forward to working with our colleagues at EPA to improve the existing regulations and seek additional epidemiological research on low levels of radiation. We'll also be submitting written comments. Thank you very much for the opportunity to speak.

Andrea Drinkard: Thank you, Nancy. Operator, next line, please?

Operator: Our next comment comes from the line of Ulla Reeves with National Parks Conservation Association.

Ulla Reeves; Hi, good afternoon, my name is Ulla Reeves and I'm with the National Parks Conservation Association speaking on behalf of our 1.2 million members and supporters who include a wide range and diverse group of baby boomers and millennials, liberals and conservatives, history (busts) and outdoor enthusiasts. They all share commitment to preserve America's past and protect our future, a concept that is at the heart of America's national parks.

We advocate for the health of national park ecosystems and the billions of people who cherish them and visit every year. In fact, just last year, our national parks generated nearly \$35 billion for the U.S. economy, supporting 320,000 jobs across the country.

We are deeply concerned about the EPA's process and motivation for repealing, replacing or modifying regulations that we believe are critical to the future of our treasured national parks. EPA plays a fundamental role in safeguarding our iconic public lands and their air, water, wildlife and the people who visit them through the environmental regulations that exist today.

Because most resource threats exist beyond park boundaries, they are ultimately under EPA's regulatory jurisdiction, it is EPA's duty to ensure that state implementation and enforcement of the environmental regulations comport with bedrock laws like the Clean Air Act and Americans depend on EPA to work with federal land managers including the national park service industries, states and the public to safeguard our pristine wild places and mitigate existing or potential threats.

We often press for more stringent safeguards because their quality problems are very much still in existence but we recognize that EPA has typically served its park protection duties in earnest.

The Office of Air and Radiation has delivered enormous benefits to the public in upholding the Clean Air Act visibility protection mandate as well as its good neighbor and acid rain programs.

Over the last 15 years, the advancements of these and other critical clean air policies have restored an average of 20 miles of visibility in the East and places like Shenandoah National Park and Okefenokee National Wildlife Refuge. And in the West, these programs have returned 30 miles on average of clear views to places such as Arches National Park and John Muir Wilderness.

These same policies make it safer for children to breathe and support longer park stays thus even further bolstering local economies.

We respectfully request that instead of pursuing repeal or weakening of regulations named in the executive orders, the EPA ought to continue to implement and enforce the sound regulations already on the books.

EPA ought to be asking how to better and more efficiently carry out its mission of protecting public health in the environment, not how to retreat from it by minimizing safeguards. We ask that EPA amend its current process by holding public hearings across the country to fully consider citizen and stakeholder input on regulatory reform and we urge EPA to make this process more thorough and balanced. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Andrea Drinkard: Thanks, Ulla. Operator, next line, please?

Operator: Our next comment comes from the line of Richard Wells Fargo with Offshore Marine Services.

Richard Wells: Good afternoon, everyone. I wish to address an unintended negative impact on U.S. shipyards by the recently implemented North American Emissions Control Area or ECA. The International Maritime Organization or IMO through the International

International Maritime Organization or IMO through the International MARPOL Convention Annex VI designated the coastal waters of the United States as an ECA. Under MARPOL Annex VI and the related U.S. EPA rules and the act to prevent pollution from ships, no vessel built on or after January

1, 2016 with an IMO tier 2 engine can operate that engine within the North American ECA.

A U.S. shipyard building a vessel with an IMO tier 2 engine for use outside the North American ECA is prevented from testing and delivering the vessel without violating the MARPOL and EPA rules.

Also, any ship built outside the United States in 2016 or later with an IMO tier 2 engine is prohibited from entering the ECA to transit to any U.S. shipyard for repairs or dry docking. Further, a dual fuel ship both LNG and diesel fuel that was specifically built to exceed the IMO tier 3 standards will during a voyage to a shipyard for maintenance and repair of the ship or repair of the dual fuel engine is temporarily prohibited from using or carrying gas fuel and therefore would not comply with the IMO and EPA ECA requirements.

So, we urge the EPA to modify the act to prevent pollution from ships to match recent changes to IMO Annex VI which were proposed by the U.S. delegation to the IMO to address this situation.

This exemption would allow a ship with tier 2 engines constructed after the effective date of our ECA to operate in our ECA when related to original construction, conversion, maintenance and repair of the ship or maintenance or repair of a dual fuel engine while it is prohibited from using or carrying gas fuel due to repair facility safety requirements.

To minimize potential adverse environmental impacts of this exemption, the exemption could be subject to some additional conditions such as the exemption is temporary only long enough to allow the ship to proceed to and from the shipyard.

The engines onboard must meet IMO tier 2 NOx limits, the ship may not load or unload cargo while operating in the ECA and the ship sails directly to and from the shipyard, or in the case of a dual fuel vessel, directly to the nearest gas fuel bunkering facility located in the ECA.

Andrea Drinkard: Thank you, Richard. Your time is up.

Richard Wells: Thank you for this consideration of this -- a fix for this unintended impact to the U.S. shipyard industry.

Andrea Drinkard: Thank you, Richard. Operator, next line?

Operator: OK. Our next comment comes from the line of John Young. John, your line is open. We're not hearing you. John Young, your line is open.

Andrea Drinkard: Thanks, operator. I think we'll go to the -- to the next caller.

Operator: Our next question comes from the line -- our next comment, sorry, comes from the line of Terri McCartney with, Hopland Band of Pomo Indians.

Terri McCartney: Hello? Hello?

Andrea Drinkard: Yes, we can -- yes, we can hear you?

Terri McCartney: OK. Hi, I'm Terri McCartney with the Hopland Band of Pomo Indians in Northern California. And I'd like to remind everybody that air move, it is not restricted within boundary -- state boundary, travel boundary, reservations.

And it's critical to have a strong EPA with oversight of the air quality because having states take on jurisdiction and of regulations can have unintended consequences of the air quality throughout the region.

This is very important for EPA to consider when looking into repealing regulations that can impact tribes to try to -- this report -- this reporting an amount of asthma and respiratory conditions caused by poor air quality which is -- also has been impacted by inferior workmanship in housing with high levels of formaldehyde and (black mold) and other building materials.

So, we respectfully request that EPA consider all of the options when looking into changing regulations that could impact the (disadvantaged) communities. Thank you.

Andrea Drinkard: Thank you, Terri. Operator, next line, please?

Operator: Our next comment comes from the line of (Delena Triono) with Citizens.

(Delena Triono): Hi. Can you hear me?

Andrea Drinkard: Yes, we can hear you.

(Delena Triono): OK, great. My name is (Delena Triono). I'm a citizen of the United States and I'm not affiliated with any organization. I'm calling to strongly oppose dismantling any regulations provided and enforced in the Clean Air Act by the EPA.

These rules which have -- which were stated here are even decades ago already...

(Off-Mic)

(Delena Triono): ...protect citizens and the environment. But they are all we have. However, it would be enormously detrimental to dismantle the laws that are in place.

I live in New York City and in New Jersey most of my life, and even with the existing rules, it is not uncommon to get air quality alerts, warning people to limit their time outdoors.

While living in New Jersey, we even have warnings from the city alerting us not to open our windows as there were airborne toxins being released into the air due to unearthing of toxic wastes nearby. This was -- it was so bad that our children in our local schools could not go outside and play during recess. We have -- they have to be kept indoors the whole day.

For weeks, the entire household, our entire household suffered from constant and severe headaches, vertigos, dizziness and general ill-feelings that lasted for months. We got to the point where our house has to be inspected for carbon monoxide poisoning and gas leakage.

Fortunately, everything in our home are safe, but it proves that the suffering was from the industrial activity that was going on in our city which caused

them to unearth those toxic wastes. We had to be moved out of the -- out of the city and into the countryside just so that our family could breathe without feeling ill.

While these are just my personal experience, they are not isolated incidents. In fact, there's a multitude of other and intimately more outrageous practices which while they are legal have devastating impact on the people and -- on the people that live in those areas.

The core access pipeline, the water practice in Flint, Michigan and the Exxon gas well exposure in Pennsylvania which killed one person and then the town people were later rewarded with pizza gift cards for their trouble.

These are all examples of widespread regulations that are while are protecting are just not doing enough to really do what the institution is supposed to do. All these -- all these actions were legal under current regulations, but these actions negatively impacted 1,000s of people in different areas of the country.

And in my personal experience, it made everyone in our city including all of the children in our school sick for weeks and months. Many of the people in the energy companies looking to rules and regulations for the sake of profits nor any of their family members will ever, ever have to (inaudible) through the negative impacts of the damage they are causing. They are biased by process.

Andrea Drinkard: Thank you, (Delena). Your time is up.

(Delena Triono): And this is what they are in favor of...

(Off-Mic)

(Delena Triono): Hello?

Andrea Drinkard: Yes, your time is up. Operator, would you, please, open the next one?

(Delena Triono): OK, sorry.

Operator: Our next comment comes from the line of Andy Bessler with National Tribal Air Association.

Andy Bessler: Thank you. Hello. My name is Andy Bessler, Project Director for the National Tribal Air Association. NTAA's mission is to advance air quality management policies and programs consistent with the needs, interests and unique legal status of American Indian tribes and Alaska natives.

NTAA has 120 member tribes and serve all 567 federally recognized tribes. Tribes are honored to serve as important partners of federal state and local agencies to protect ambient air quality, indoor air quality and mitigate climate change.

NTAA will be providing written comments to EPA on Executive Order 13777 enforcing the regulatory reform agenda by May 15th. While NTAA appreciates the opportunity to provide comments within the short timeframe allotted for this process, NTAA can only offer these general comments at this time.

Since 1984, EPA's policy of working with tribes has been based on close coordination in respect for travel self-determination and sovereignty consistent with EPA's policy for the administration of environmental programs on Indian reservation signed in 1984 by President Reagan and reaffirmed by every administrations since that time.

This policy directs EPA to work in close coordination with the tribes and respect travel determination and sovereignty. Therefore, in the spirit of EPA's existing policies, NTAA requests a government to government consultation with tribes so the EPA can hear from tribes directly on their perspectives related to E.O. 13777.

We encourage EPA to demonstrate this continued commitment to developing and enforcing strong air quality regulations based on sounds science as well as support sovereignty and self-determination of states, local governments and tribes to the appropriate and adequate allocation of funding for state, local and travel air programs.

In relation to air quality regulations, I offer this perspective from EPA's own data. Since EPA's creation in 1970 during the Nixon administration, the Clean Air Act has successfully reduced air pollution that impacts public health significantly.

Since 1980, aggregate emissions of criteria pollutants and air toxics have decreased by nearly 70 percent while gross domestic product has grown by 153 percent, vehicle miles traveled have increased by 106 percent and our population has grown by 41 percent, all since 1980. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Andrea Drinkard: Thank you, Andy. Operator, next line, please?

Operator: Our next comment comes from the line of Katie Huffling with Alliance of Nurses.

Katie Huffling: Hi, thank you, good afternoon. My name is Katie Huffling and I'm the Executive Director of the Alliance of Nurses for Healthy Environments. We're the only national nursing organization focusing solely on the environment and health.

We would like to express our strong support for ensuring that healthy protective regulations which is the Clean Air Act are kept in place. Evidence has shown that the Clean Air Act and accompanying regulations have contributed to reductions in air pollution resulting in prevention of over 160,000 premature deaths yearly as well as other adverse health outcomes such as heart attacks, asthma attacks and hospital admissions.

Repealing or modifying regulations showed to improve health and save lives, will contribute to undue harm to the public especially to our most vulnerable populations such as pregnant women and children.

As a nurse and midwife, my goal is to help women and families have the healthiest pregnancies possible. Fortunately, air pollution and ground level

ozone can present a challenge for women and children who are especially sensitive to the negative impacts of these pollutants.

I've seen firsthand how poor air quality days can have a significant effect on the health of pregnant women. Many times, my asthmatic patients would come into my office wheezing or report increased use of their inhalers on poor air quality days.

Having good control of asthma is an essential part of a healthy pregnancy as the mother's breasts are the baby's only source of oxygen.

We caution pregnant women to stay inside in poor air quality days as exposure to air pollution has been linked to poor pregnancy outcomes, exacerbation of asthma and lung irritation. Exposure to particulate matter during pregnancy is linked to pre-term birth, low birth weight and small for gestational age infants.

These adverse birth outcomes are serious conditions that can lead to a variety of short and long-term health impacts for the baby, and greater risk of chronic disease as an adult such as diabetes, high blood pressure and obesity.

We are also seeing long-term changes in the lungs of children whose mothers were exposed to higher levels of air pollution while pregnant. These changes can lead to an increased risk of asthma and decreased lung function in these children.

The financial implications of treating adverse birth outcomes and chronic illness across the lifespan, their (cause) are worsened by air pollution, should be accounted for when determining the cost effectiveness, the necessity of implementing regulations.

The total annual cost of treating asthma alone is estimated at more than \$56 billion. The direct benefits of implementing clean air programs has vastly exceeded cost of implementation assuming health outcomes and contributing

to a stronger economy by preventing millions of lost workdays and increasing work productivity.

Regulations that ensure clean air for all Americans are essentially to save lives and protect health. That's why the Alliance of Nurses for Healthy Environments supports ensuring strong clean air regulations are continued. Thank you for this opportunity to comment today and I urge the EPA to continue to safeguard these health protective regulations.

Andrea Drinkard: Thank you, Katie. We're getting very close to the end of our call. I think we'll probably have time for about two to three more speakers. Operator, would you open the next line, please?

Operator: Our next comment comes from the line of Theodora Birdbear with Fort Berthold POWER.

Theodora Birdbear: Hello. My name is Theodora Birdbear. I'm a member of Fort Berthold POWER which stands for Protectors of Water & Earth Rights. I'm a tribal member living on the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation in Western North Dakota in the Bakken oilfields.

We, tribal members, are directly affected by the EPA's air and radiation regulations for the industry. And I object to any weakening of EPA's air and radiation rules. I live in Mandaree which is targeted for the unconventional oil and gas drilling, fracking and flaring.

For the last nine years, these flaring and leaky wells have been placed by -- within 500 feet or less to tribal homes including near very young children who live in those homes. This is a public health issue.

There are more than 1,000 flaring wells within Fort Berthold boundaries and another 1,500 wells are planned or expected right now. And for the last nine years, tons of extracted natural gas which includes the greenhouse gas methane has been dumped directly into the air that we breathe on Fort Berthold Indian Reservation.

The EPA's air quality rules are critically important to the public health and safety of tribal members on the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation and must be strengthened, not weakened, air quality enforcement must also be strengthened anywhere in Indian country including on Fort Berthold.

So, EPA, I'm asking you to don't cater to the oil and gas industry by weakening your air quality regulations, protect the public health of all including we, tribal members, on the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation. I will be submitting written comments also. Thank you.

Andrea Drinkard: Thank you, Theodora. Operator, next -- why don't you open the next line, please?

Operator: Our next comment comes from the line of (Joanna Malk) with (Newmant Mini). (Joanna), your line is open. You may be on mute. (Joanna), your line is open. You may be on mute.

Andrea Drinkard: Operator, we can go to the next line, please.

Operator: Our next comment comes from the line of (Mark Kragel) with Vanguard Natural Resources.

(Mark Kragel): Yes, this is (Mark Kragel) with Vanguard Natural Resources, an oil and gas acquisition company, and I would like to encourage the EPA to relax the bureau of land management's methane standards which is putting a very undue burden on very small wells -- oil and gas wells where the cost to recover the methane would be far more than cost to sell the oil and gas. So, that's my comment, thank you.

Andrea Drinkard: Thank you very much, (Mark). Operator, next line, please?

Operator: Our next comment comes from the line of Theodora Scarato, Environmental Health.

Theodora Scarato: Hi. The Environmental Health Trust is a scientific organization conducting research -- can you hear me.

Female: I lost signal.

Theodora Scarato: Hello?

Andrea Drinkard: Yes, we can hear you.

Theodora Scarato: Hello?

Andrea Drinkard: We can hear you. We can hear you.

Theodora Scarato: OK. The Environmental Health Trust is a scientific organization conducting research on environmental health risks and prevention. We ask the EPA to update their public recommendations on non-ionizing electromagnetic radiation to fully inform the public about the current best available science and how to fully reduce exposure from the technology devices we use every day.

Since the World Health Organization's international agency with the research on cancer classified radiofrequency, radiation is a class 2B carcinogen (and 211) and evidence has significantly increased, showing the long-term radiofrequency radiation could cause cancer.

A recent animal study performed by the National Toxicology Program in the United States found an increased incidence of cancer and increased DNA damage in rats with prolonged exposure to radiofrequency fields.

They were said to mimic a lifetime of wireless exposure. Importantly, these adverse effects occurred at levels below those that caused thermal injury. Therefore, FCC regulations which are only based on thermal effects do not provide adequate protection for the public as stated by the California Medical Association in their wireless resolution in 2014.

Peer reviewed research has demonstrated adverse biological effects of wireless EMF including single and double stranded DNA breaks, creation of reactive oxygen species, immune dysfunction, cognitive processing effects, stress protein synthesis in the brain, altered brain development, sleep and

memory disturbances, ADHD, abnormal behavior, sperm dysfunction, and brain tumors.

The EPA needs to inform the public that cell phones and wireless devices were never premarket tested for long-term safety. Substantial peer reviewed research indicates not only cancer but also adverse effects to the brain and reproductive system from wireless radiation.

Over a dozen governments such as France, Belgium and Israel have online public resource specifically recommending that children's exposure be minimized. And their governments provide very details resources detailing how you can reduce exposure with everything from cell phones to baby monitors to laptops. We don't have that in the EPA. There were only three lines of texts on this.

The American Academy of Pediatrics now recommends that children's exposure to cell phones be reduced and specifies steps parents can take to reduce exposure such as make only short or essential calls on the cell phones, avoid carrying the phone against your body like in a pocket, sock or bra because cell phone manufacturers can't guarantee that the amount of radiation you're absorbing will be at the safe level.

In fact, people are likely absorbing radiation levels higher than government standards because before phones and wireless devices came in the market, their radiation tested at distances away from the body, not against the body.

So, for example, many cells phones are tested in about half an inch or less.

Andrea Drinkard: Thanks, Theodora. Your time is up. Operator, would you, please, open the last line. We'll have one more commenter today. Thank you.

Operator: And our final comment comes from the line of (Ernest Erlemond) with Earthjustice.

(Ernest Erlemond): Thank you. Please wake up, I know it's been a long day. Houses in cities are being photographed in gulf and wood smoke. While the (DHHS)

and everyone else proclaims that there is no safe level of any kind of smoke because...

(Off-Mic)

(Ernest Erlemond): ...such as asthma attacks, heart attacks, cancer and so on.

Obviously, the Clean Air Act is not protecting...

(Off-Mic)

(Ernest Erlemond): And safety as required by the law. So, please revise it. Every revision so far has been much better than the original, which itself was good.

And excuse me for getting technical here, but average P.M. 2.5 from visibility maps converted to P.M. 2.5 maps is about 15 micrograms per cubic meter in most places. And the toxic equivalent is 150 micrograms per cubic meter because 50 percent of it is wood smoke.

So, please prevent the hotspot pollution in houses and you will prevent most regional air pollution problems like the problems in Fairbanks. Please ban all fireplaces and stoves from burning (core wood) in neighborhoods like London banned coal burning in fireplaces unless it can be proved safe. Thank you for allowing me to speak.

Andrea Drinkard: Thank you, (Ernest). And thank you, everyone, for joining us today. We appreciate all of your inputs. Again, if you did not have the opportunity to speak on today's call or if you had additional comments that you'd like to provide, please submit your input to the EPA (Why) docket. Again, that number is EPA-HQ-OA-2017-0190. Thank you again and have a great day.

Operator: This concludes today's conference call. You may now disconnect your lines.

END

To: Samulski, Michael[samulski.michael@epa.gov]; Manning, Bryan[manning.bryan@epa.gov]
From: Sargeant, Kathryn
Sent: Wed 1/25/2017 6:46:04 PM
Subject: And yet more! OGC comments on Draft info to SAB for their screening of scientific basis for major agency planned actions
EPA action description Aircraft GHG rule 1-23-17+do+mt.docx

Sorry, I thought what I sent you represented OGC's total comments.

Here are some from Thrift on paragraph 5.

Are you ok with these? If not, please feel free to interact with OGC directly and cc me. I don't mean to get in the middle of communication between you all.

From: Thrift, Mike
Sent: Wednesday, January 25, 2017 1:38 PM
To: Orlin, David <Orlin.David@epa.gov>; Sargeant, Kathryn <sargeant.kathryn@epa.gov>; Dubois, Roland <Dubois.Roland@epa.gov>
Cc: Williams, Melina <Williams.Melina@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: FYI/For your review by 2 pm 1/25: Draft info to SAB for their screening of scientific basis for major agency planned actions

I had a few more suggested edits in the paragraph discussing the schedule. I think

Ex. 5 - Attorney Client

Ex. 5 - Attorney Client

From: Orlin, David
Sent: Wednesday, January 25, 2017 8:23 AM
To: Sargeant, Kathryn <sargeant.kathryn@epa.gov>; Thrift, Mike <thrift.mike@epa.gov>; Dubois, Roland <Dubois.Roland@epa.gov>
Cc: Williams, Melina <Williams.Melina@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: FYI/For your review by 2 pm 1/25: Draft info to SAB for their screening of scientific basis for major agency planned actions

Kathryn,

Thanks for the heads up and circulating these. I am attaching a couple of minor suggestions (just editorial) to the aircraft paper (and one question for future reference about the scope of our treaty obligations, which you or Mike may know the answer to).

David Orlin

U.S. EPA, Office of General Counsel

(202) 564-1222

From: Sargeant, Kathryn

Sent: Tuesday, January 24, 2017 9:07 AM

To: Orlin, David <Orlin.David@epa.gov>; Thrift, Mike <thrift.mike@epa.gov>; Dubois, Roland <Dubois.Roland@epa.gov>

Subject: FYI/For your review by 2 pm 1/25: Draft info to SAB for their screening of scientific basis for major agency planned actions

Importance: High

Dear all,

As you can see from my message below, we have received the call for info to the SAB on our planned regulatory actions.

Attached are the documents we intend to submit (on the RFS annual rule, aircraft Pb endangerment, and aircraft GHG standards).

These have been developed by the teams and reviewed by Machiele, Hoyer, Samulski (respectively), and me.

These obviously don't focus on any legal issues but I wanted to be sure you (a) know this process is happening; and (b) have an opportunity to look at them if you'd like (they're very short).

Will you let me know by 2 pm on Weds if you have any comments or concerns? Obviously I'm happy to answer any questions you might have, at any time.

Thanks in advance!!

From: Sargeant, Kathryn

Sent: Tuesday, January 24, 2017 8:42 AM

To: Charmley, William <charmley.william@epa.gov>; Grundler, Christopher <grundler.christopher@epa.gov>; Hengst, Benjamin <Hengst.Benjamin@epa.gov>; Burch, Julia <Burch.Julia@epa.gov>

Cc: Simon, Karl <Simon.Karl@epa.gov>; Cook, Leila <cook.leila@epa.gov>; Samulski, Michael <samulski.michael@epa.gov>; Hoyer, Marion <hoyer.marion@epa.gov>; Machiele, Paul <machiele.paul@epa.gov>; Parsons, Christy <Parsons.Christy@epa.gov>; Manning, Bryan <manning.bryan@epa.gov>; Burkholder, Dallas <burkholder.dallas@epa.gov>

Subject: FYI/For your review: Draft info to SAB for their screening of scientific basis for major agency planned actions

As you likely recall, EPA provides the Science Advisory Board (SAB) with an opportunity to give advice on the science that supports rules identified in EPA's semiannual Regulatory Agenda.

This involves EPA developing descriptions of planned actions (according to previously developed templates) for SAB consideration.

The Fall 2016 Reg Agenda had three OTAQ actions that require a description to be provided to the SAB:

--RFS standards for 2018 and biomass based diesel volume for 2019

--Aircraft lead endangerment finding

--Aircraft GHG emissions standards

I am attaching the descriptions that I recommend sending up through the process.

They are due to OAR/OAPPS tomorrow (Jan. 25), where they will be reviewed and then sent up for EPA's transmittal to SAB, which convenes a Work Group to review them.

Will you please let me know by 2 pm Weds. the 25th if you have any comments, questions, or concerns?

I will be sending them to OAPPS Weds. afternoon and providing OGC an opportunity for review in parallel with yours.

Thanks,

Kathryn

To: Samulski, Michael[samulski.michael@epa.gov]; Sutton, Tia[sutton.tia@epa.gov]; Manning, Bryan[manning.bryan@epa.gov]; Audette, Lucie[audette.lucie@epa.gov]
Cc: Jantarasami, Lesley[Jantarasami.Lesley@epa.gov]; Williams, Melina[Williams.Melina@epa.gov]; Orlin, David[Orlin.David@epa.gov]
From: Thrift, Mike
Sent: Thur 5/19/2016 6:10:00 PM
Subject: RE: For response by Weds, 5/25: Senate Appropriations QFRs - one Aircraft question here
SAC QFRs_OAR only_opmo draft - mjs-mt.docx

I have some suggested edits added to Mike S's edits. Please note the final one

Ex. 5 - Attorney Client

From: Samulski, Michael
Sent: Thursday, May 19, 2016 6:55 AM
To: Sutton, Tia <sutton.tia@epa.gov>; Manning, Bryan <manning.bryan@epa.gov>; Audette, Lucie <audette.lucie@epa.gov>
Cc: Jantarasami, Lesley <Jantarasami.Lesley@epa.gov>; Thrift, Mike <thrift.mike@epa.gov>; Williams, Melina <Williams.Melina@epa.gov>; Orlin, David <Orlin.David@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: For response by Weds, 5/25: Senate Appropriations QFRs - one Aircraft question here

We have a prepared response to the aircraft question. I copied it into the attached document.

Mike

Michael Samulski

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Office of Transportation and Air Quality
Director, Large Marine and Aircraft Center
1 (734) 214-4532
samulski.michael@epa.gov

From: Sutton, Tia
Sent: Wednesday, May 18, 2016 5:38 PM
To: Samulski, Michael <samulski.michael@epa.gov>; Manning, Bryan <manning.bryan@epa.gov>; Audette, Lucie <audette.lucie@epa.gov>
Cc: Jantarasami, Lesley <Jantarasami.Lesley@epa.gov>; Thrift, Mike <thrift.mike@epa.gov>; Williams, Melina <Williams.Melina@epa.gov>; Orlin, David <Orlin.David@epa.gov>
Subject: For response by Weds, 5/25: Senate Appropriations QFRs - one Aircraft question here

Hi all,

Attached are Questions for the Record (QFRs) from the Senate Appropriations Committee on the FY2017 budget. The very first question is Aircraft-related, so I'm sending your way for a response. Note that OPMO has taken a stab at a response, so I've flagged it here for you all to review/edit as you see fit. Please send me any edits you have by **Wednesday, May 25th**.

Lesley- you will likely receive this from Jackie, but I'm cc'ing you here just so you know that I have sent this out to OTAQ folks as well.

Mike, Melina, and Dave – up to you if you'd like to edit/review along with OTAQ & OAP, or if you'd prefer to just get the whole document for review once OAR has finished drafting responses (if you draft & review now, we'll make sure to flag this one as done when the rest of the responses to these QFRs come your way for review).

Thanks!

-Tia

From: LaRue, Steven

Sent: Wednesday, May 18, 2016 4:24 PM

To: Sutton, Tia <sutton.tia@epa.gov>; Haley, Mike <Haley.Mike@epa.gov>; Ashley, Jackie <Ashley.Jackie@epa.gov>; Noonan, Jenny <Noonan.Jenny@epa.gov>; Terry, Sara <Terry.Sara@epa.gov>; Whitlow, Jeff <Whitlow.Jeff@epa.gov>; Krieger, Jackie <Krieger.Jackie@epa.gov>; Bullard, Pamela <Bullard.Pamela@epa.gov>; Lindo, Talitha <lindo.talitha@epa.gov>

Cc: Hyde, Courtney <Hyde.Courtney@epa.gov>; Walters, Margaret <Walters.Margaret@epa.gov>; Lubetsky, Jonathan <Lubetsky.Jonathan@epa.gov>

Subject: SAC QFRs (DUE 5/25)

All,

In the attached file are front office drafts of the few QFRs received from Senate Approps earlier this week. So to not cross lines with what I sent out this afternoon from House Energy and Commerce (higher priority), included below is a status update of where all budget hearing QFRs are in the process:

House Approps > Cleared OMB and sent to the committee ✓

House E&C > Sent back to programs to address front office comments (Wed 5/18/2016 2:37 PM) *Due back to us as soon as possible*

Senate Approps > First drafts sent to programs (attached) *Due back to us by next Wednesday*

Senate EPW > Not yet received by OAR

Please provide your concurrence/edits by Wednesday, May 25th.

Thanks,

- Steve

From: Budget and Planning

Sent: Monday, May 16, 2016 2:36 PM

To: OCFO-SBO <OCFOSBO@epa.gov>

Cc: OCFO-SBO-STAFF <OCFOSBOSTAFF@epa.gov>; OCFO-OB-Media Analysts <OCFOOBMedia_Analysts@epa.gov>; Terris, Carol <Terris.Carol@epa.gov>; Williams, Maria <Williams.Maria@epa.gov>; Baker, Lucille <Baker.Lucille@epa.gov>; Jones, JackJr <jones.jackjr@epa.gov>; Ripley, Laura <Ripley.Laura@epa.gov>; Beg, Gul <Beg.Gul@epa.gov>; Boyd, Wyatt <Boyd.Wyatt@epa.gov>; Volin, Phyllis <Volin.Phyllis@epa.gov>; Tidwell-Shelton, Patricia <Tidwell-Shelton.Patricia@epa.gov>; Walsh, Ed <Walsh.Ed@epa.gov>; Wood, Nikki <Wood.Nikki@epa.gov>; McCluney, Lance <McCluney.Lance@epa.gov>

Subject: SAC EPA Questions for the Record

Importance: High

Hello Senior Budget Officers –

Attached are the FY 2017 Senate Appropriation Committee (SAC) Hearing Questions for the Record. Additional guidance will be forthcoming. Please review and begin preparing your responses while we load and assign the questions in the Lotus Notes database.

Please contact your Media Analyst with any questions or concerns.

Rebecca A. Muse

Program Analyst • Office of the Chief Financial Officer / Office of Budget

Office: 202.564.2978 | Email: muse.rebecca@epa.gov |

To: Samulski, Michael[samulski.michael@epa.gov]; Manning, Bryan[manning.bryan@epa.gov]; Audette, Lucie[audette.lucie@epa.gov]
Cc: Jantarasami, Lesley[Jantarasami.Lesley@epa.gov]; Thrift, Mike[thrift.mike@epa.gov]; Williams, Melina[Williams.Melina@epa.gov]; Orlin, David[Orlin.David@epa.gov]
From: Sutton, Tia
Sent: Wed 5/18/2016 9:38:08 PM
Subject: For response by Weds, 5/25: Senate Appropriations QFRs - one Aircraft question here
SAC QFRs_OAR only_opmo draft.docx

Hi all,

Attached are Questions for the Record (QFRs) from the Senate Appropriations Committee on the FY2017 budget. The very first question is Aircraft-related, so I'm sending your way for a response. Note that OPMO has taken a stab at a response, so I've flagged it here for you all to review/edit as you see fit. Please send me any edits you have by **Wednesday, May 25th**.

Lesley- you will likely receive this from Jackie, but I'm cc'ing you here just so you know that I have sent this out to OTAQ folks as well.

Mike, Melina, and Dave – up to you if you'd like to edit/review along with OTAQ & OAP, or if you'd prefer to just get the whole document for review once OAR has finished drafting responses (if you draft & review now, we'll make sure to flag this one as done when the rest of the responses to these QFRs come your way for review).

Thanks!

-Tia

From: LaRue, Steven
Sent: Wednesday, May 18, 2016 4:24 PM
To: Sutton, Tia <sutton.tia@epa.gov>; Haley, Mike <Haley.Mike@epa.gov>; Ashley, Jackie <Ashley.Jackie@epa.gov>; Noonan, Jenny <Noonan.Jenny@epa.gov>; Terry, Sara <Terry.Sara@epa.gov>; Whitlow, Jeff <Whitlow.Jeff@epa.gov>; Krieger, Jackie <Krieger.Jackie@epa.gov>; Bullard, Pamela <Bullard.Pamela@epa.gov>; Lindo, Talitha <lindo.talitha@epa.gov>
Cc: Hyde, Courtney <Hyde.Courtney@epa.gov>; Walters, Margaret <Walters.Margaret@epa.gov>; Lubetsky, Jonathan <Lubetsky.Jonathan@epa.gov>
Subject: SAC QFRs (DUE 5/25)

All,

In the attached file are front office drafts of the few QFRs received from Senate Approps earlier this week. So to not cross lines with what I sent out this afternoon from House Energy and Commerce (higher priority), included below is a status update of where all budget hearing QFRs are in the process:

House Approps > Cleared OMB and sent to the committee ✓

House E&C > Sent back to programs to address front office comments (Wed 5/18/2016 2:37 PM) *Due back to us as soon as possible*

Senate Approps > First drafts sent to programs (attached) *Due back to us by next Wednesday*

Senate EPW > Not yet received by OAR

Please provide your concurrence/edits by Wednesday, May 25th.

Thanks,

- Steve

From: Budget and Planning

Sent: Monday, May 16, 2016 2:36 PM

To: OCFO-SBO <OCFOSBO@epa.gov>

Cc: OCFO-SBO-STAFF <OCFOSBOSTAFF@epa.gov>; OCFO-OB-Media Analysts <OCFOOBMedia_Analysts@epa.gov>; Terris, Carol <Terris.Carol@epa.gov>; Williams, Maria <Williams.Maria@epa.gov>; Baker, Lucille <Baker.Lucille@epa.gov>; Jones, Jack Jr <jones.jackjr@epa.gov>; Ripley, Laura <Ripley.Laura@epa.gov>; Beg, Gul <Beg.Gul@epa.gov>; Boyd, Wyatt <Boyd.Wyatt@epa.gov>; Volin, Phyllis <Volin.Phyllis@epa.gov>; Tidwell-Shelton, Patricia <Tidwell-Shelton.Patricia@epa.gov>; Walsh, Ed <Walsh.Ed@epa.gov>; Wood, Nikki <Wood.Nikki@epa.gov>; McCluney, Lance

<McCluney.Lance@epa.gov>

Subject: SAC EPA Questions for the Record

Importance: High

Hello Senior Budget Officers –

Attached are the FY 2017 Senate Appropriation Committee (SAC) Hearing Questions for the Record. Additional guidance will be forthcoming. Please review and begin preparing your responses while we load and assign the questions in the Lotus Notes database.

Please contact your Media Analyst with any questions or concerns.

Rebecca A. Muse

Program Analyst • Office of the Chief Financial Officer / Office of Budget

Office: 202.564.2978 | Email: muse.rebecca@epa.gov |